



Columbia University  
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



THE SELIGMAN LIBRARY OF ECONOMICS

PURCHASED BY THE UNIVERSITY

1929

*Geo. G. Granger*

BA

1877

*Aug. 1877*  
THE CONFLICT

BETWEEN

LABOR AND CAPITAL.

BY

ALBERT S. BOLLES,

AUTHOR OF "CHAPTERS IN POLITICAL ECONOMY," AND EDITOR OF  
THE "NORWICH MORNING BULLETIN."

---

PHILADELPHIA:

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.

1877.

Columbia University  
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



THE SELIGMAN LIBRARY OF ECONOMICS

PURCHASED BY THE UNIVERSITY

1929



THE CONFLICT  
BETWEEN  
LABOR AND CAPITAL.



# THE CONFLICT

BETWEEN

# LABOR AND CAPITAL.

BY

ALBERT S. BOLLES,

AUTHOR OF "CHAPTERS IN POLITICAL ECONOMY," AND EDITOR OF  
THE "NORWICH MORNING BULLETIN."

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.  
1877.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1876, by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

---

Salamanca  
1877A  
863

TO THE  
HON. NATHANIEL WHEELER,  
OF BRIDGEPORT,

WHOSE LONG AND SUCCESSFUL CAREER ILLUSTRATES THE KINDLY  
FEELING AND RECOGNIZED MUTUAL INTEREST WHICH MAY  
EXIST BETWEEN EMPLOYED AND EMPLOYER,

THIS VOLUME IS DEDICATED  
BY THE AUTHOR.





## PREFACE.

---

THE greater portion of this work was written during the first half of last year, when the author was visiting several countries of Europe. Many of the facts were gathered from personal inquiry, while others were obtained from official reports and equally reliable sources. The author trusts that the work will prove useful, both to the working-man and to his employer, in the way of toning down the antagonism existing between the two classes, and in leading them to see more perfectly their true relations to each other. No theories have been invented or fanciful speculations indulged in, as it could hardly be expected that those for whom the work is primarily designed would have the inclination to read anything of such a character. Practical information is wanted; and this he has attempted to furnish, not from any experience of his own, but from the direct and indirect experience of trustworthy witnesses.

No work has yet appeared in this country treating

so extensively of trade-unions, their evils, their working, and what may be expected of them in the future. As these societies have developed more fully in Great Britain than in the United States, for the reason that they have flourished there during a longer period, consequently they can be studied there with greater profit by American employers of labor. By learning their history, both the capitalist and the trade-unionist himself are put in possession of facts which will lead them away from the errors into which both classes have fallen in the old world. The investigation into the organization and rules of trade-unions and other associations, undertaken by the British Government in 1867, was exceedingly valuable; for the most experienced employers of labor in all parts of the kingdom, and also the leading trade-unionists, were examined, and their testimony was published in full, thus putting all who could obtain the report in possession of the very best information concerning these societies, and other matters of vital interest to employed and employer. From this source facts have been liberally drawn; and the report furnishes by far the most valuable body of information on this subject which can be found anywhere.

At the fourth chapter, relating to the payment of labor, those economists who hold that political economy has nothing to do with moral science will sneer, as useless and out of place in a work like this. But all have an equal right to retain their opinions, and if our argument be sound, it is all the stronger for squaring both with moral and economic science. If it be affirmed that, admitting the truth of the principle sought to be established, it cannot be enforced, the same thing may be said of almost any other truth, whether of an economic or any other character. It is none the less one's duty, however, to find out what is right and expedient, though knowing that neither the one thing nor the other will be heeded.

NORWICH, CONN., March 1, 1876.



# CONTENTS.

---

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. PRESENT RELATIONS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL . . .	17
II. THE SUPERABUNDANCE OF LABOR . . . . .	29
III. HOW THE WORKING CLASSES ARE AFFECTED BY A RISE IN PRICES . . . . .	41
IV. THE PAYMENT OF LABOR . . . . .	74
V. THE GOOD AND EVIL OF TRADE-UNIONS . . . . .	92
VI. CO-OPERATION . . . . .	166
VII. INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIPS . . . . .	177
VIII. EDUCATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES . . . . .	190
IX. ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION . . . . .	205
APPENDIX . . . . .	207





# I.

## PRESENT RELATIONS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL.

---

To make a peace between the working-man and his employer grounded in justice and stamped with perpetuity, is the great social problem of the age. Whoever succeeds in doing this will more worthily earn a title to perpetual remembrance than any victor of battles.

The conflict between the two classes is not confined to the United States or Great Britain, but darkens all countries. It is to be noted that wherever workmen possess the highest intelligence, is the greatest discontent, strikes are oftenest, and wages most rapidly increasing.\* Not that this state of things is always to continue, but only while the relations between the two classes are undergoing readjustment. If the effect of educating working-men is to dissolve, permanently, the peaceful relations which formerly existed between them and their employers, then, indeed, might we think ignorance is bliss, as it certainly would prolong a happier condition of society than exists to-day. But the present stands to the past and to the future as a transitional period, in which the toiling millions, awaking from the dense ignorance which for ages has en-

---

\* Evidence of A. S. Hewitt before Trade-Unions Commission of Great Britain, 1867, Question 6892.

veloped them, are groping after new political rights and social enjoyments, and a higher reward for their labor. Blindly do they pursue their ends, suffering much from ignorance and prejudice, and not unfrequently actuated by selfish motives, yet who cannot see in their movements that they are trying to rise to a higher plane of living?

The conflict between the two classes is of recent date, and the employer often sighs for the old times when his word was law, and his workmen took whatever he deigned to give, and were silent. That time is no more. In the stately language of the Royal Commissioners of Great Britain who were appointed to inquire into the organization and rules of trade-unions and other associations, "the habitual code of sentiment which prevailed between employers and workmen in the times when the former were regarded by both law and usage as the governing class is now greatly relaxed, and cannot be revived." In this elder day the contentment of the working-man resulted from his helplessness, which arose from his ignorance. In many callings he never went from the town where he labored, never knew the amount of his employer's profits, never dreamed of any way by which he could improve his lot, and, as necessary to this, obtain higher wages. The spell of ignorance which dazed him has been broken. His eyes are open, and he beholds strange and wondrous things; new desires are kindled which he seeks to gratify. Moreover, that dread feeling of inferiority formerly entertained toward his employer is gone. The age of servility is past. The workman looks upon those around him as his equals,

and knows no reason, provided he honestly acquires the means, why he should not live in as much splendor and have as many enjoyments as any one. This new importance felt by the laboring man springs principally from three causes deserving brief mention.

First, education. So long as the laboring classes were steeped in ignorance their wants were fewer, and the feeling of discontent toward their employers, if existing at all, was concealed. The laborer knew not how to rise, even when the desire was felt. He was like a horse, possessing a vast deal of inborn energy, yet ignorant of its existence. Education has changed all this. He longs now for more rational living, a better house, food, and clothing. He desires education for his children and time for self-improvement. Moreover, he has found out how indispensable are his services in production.

Secondly, his importance has increased in consequence of combining with his fellow-workers. The trade-unionist believes, whether his opposers do or not, that he can wage a more successful battle by combining than he could single-handed. And the fact that employers have often yielded to the demands of these organizations, while they have rarely noticed similar demands coming from individuals, encourages this belief. Again and again have trade-unions failed in securing their ends, but the unquestioned fact that they have achieved victories directly attributable to organization has revealed their power and importance.

Thirdly, the importance of the laboring class has grown with the extension of their political rights. Nothing has led men to feel their consequence more

than the bestowal of the electoral franchise upon them. Mr. Ward, in writing of the moral, intellectual, and material condition of the working classes of Hamburg, Germany, ascribes their progress during the last forty years to the "increased importance of their position in the Republic, by the extension of the electoral franchise, which gives every laboring man a vote for political representatives." The remark may be applied to the same classes in other countries where new political rights have been conferred. The truth has dawned that many of the distinctions between men in society are assumed, not real, nor won by superior ability or virtues. Working-men begin to feel and assert that they are quite as good as their neighbors, and, as an expected outgrowth of this idea, demand that in every agreement they shall receive their full share of the benefit. Receiving fresh additions of political power, waxing strong through organized effort, growing in knowledge, with new desires unfolding, who can expect of the industrial classes satisfaction with the old order of things?

Beside, as an eminent manufacturer, whose opinion is worthy of high consideration, has said: "The general introduction of machinery, by which production has been enormously increased without, as the people believe, a corresponding rearrangement of the laws of the distribution of the proceeds," has increased "the restlessness and uneasiness which exists among the laboring men all over the world, and specially among those who are more enlightened."\*

---

\* A. S. Hewitt, testimony before Trade-Unions Com., Q. 6891.



The earnestness with which the working classes are enforcing their demands no one will gainsay. Certainly not in the present day, and perhaps in no previous ones, has greater persistence been shown by any body in trying to secure its ends. It is this stubborn spirit, which refuses to yield or be subdued, that is shaking the souls of so many employers. The strikes occurring in Great Britain and in other countries within a few years are piteous and terrible exhibitions of the devotion and desperation of the laboring classes to principles accepted as true and luminous with good to themselves. In a recent strike at South Wales, thousands lived upon the smallest allowance, while not a few died, that the interests of the larger number might not be sacrificed. The Paris Commune is a still more awful illustration of the desperation which this class has exhibited in its lawless march toward the attainment of its objects.

That some of the measures leveled by workmen at employers, and those resorted to by the latter in self-defense, should widen the breach between the two classes is to be expected. Neither class would act according to human nature if such conduct did not effect an estrangement. Hence, the growing enmity of the two classes is everywhere observable. Doubtless, trade-unions have fostered this spirit of antagonism between employers and workmen.

In the investigation before the Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the rules and organization of trade-unions, it was admitted that the cordial and friendly feeling which used to be common between the two classes was gone. The workmen, looking rather

to the approval of their unions than to the approval of their employers, were less anxious than of yore to stand well with the latter; and the employers, on their part, no longer felt under the same obligation to look after the interests of their workmen and assist them in periods of difficulty. Misunderstandings, also, which would be readily settled if free and friendly intercourse existed between them, are exasperated and prolonged. The alienation is even more complete in France. This is the natural outgrowth of the communistic principles so generally believed in by the working people. With them "no private indulgence, no public legislation can eradicate the idea that the capitalist is a vampire feeding upon their blood." However perfect may be the discipline in the workshop, outside of it the employer is without influence and respect. Anything done which he may think useful or agreeable to them, they regard, not as a boon, but a device to bribe them to additional labor. Mr. Mallett relates the instance of a large manufacturer who, in order to do a kindness to the hands in his employment, turned on a tap of hot and cold water outside the manufactory, at which any of the families living in that vicinity could come and help themselves. A workman being asked whether the innovation was well received by his fellows, replied simply, without the slightest intention of giving offense, that it appeared to be only a small part of what was due them. Entertaining such feelings and dreaming of a time when communism will prevail, employers look upon their workmen as their natural enemies, and are filled with dread, if not with hatred. Turning to Germany, we find that the relations between employer



and employed, if not so bitter as in France, are cold, and never warmed by kindly offices and mutual confidence. Says Mr. Petrie: "An admission that their mutual interests require a close reciprocity of good offices between them and their employers is the utmost to be expected from the working classes in this country. At the present day a majority of the factory operatives refuse even to admit this. All that they consent to recognize is the necessity of earning the means of subsistence." A greater alienation exists between the two classes in Belgium. So wide is the gulf that a writer who has studied the subject with great care remarks, that "one of the greatest drawbacks to the prosperity and well-being of the industrial classes consists undoubtedly in the absence of good will and confidence between them and those by whom they are employed, particularly in the great industrial centres. This especially applies to the case of large joint-stock companies, where the ties existing between the operatives and the managers are of the slenderest description." The relations subsisting between employed and employer in the Netherlands and Switzerland are like oases in the wide desert we have been surveying. Even these countries have felt, on some occasions, the breath of foul influences disturbing the peace of men and masters; yet there, as in no other lands, can the eye rest with pleasure, for the two classes live together in a kindly manner, and the condition of each is improved by the magical power of a confidence freely and helpfully given, and rarely betrayed. The United States has more slowly experienced the snapping of the ties once binding employed and employers, yet the wave

of discontent has reached this shore, and is breaking with more or less fury over every part of the land. According to one eminently qualified to judge, the feelings of mutual respect, confidence, and good will are rapidly diminishing here. Said Mr. Hewitt, a member of the firm of Cooper, Hewitt & Co., before a committee of investigation in 1867: "Within the last five years there has been a very great diminution of it, and there is a feeling of antagonism at the present time, and a very marked one."

Not so deep and wide-spread is this antagonism in the United States as in Great Britain and other European countries, but that it exists and is constantly increasing is too painfully true. Workmen display a unity of interest in respect to themselves which finds no counterpart in the action of their masters. Had the latter tried half as hard to combine their forces in order to break down the power of the working classes, they might have succeeded long ago. But they seek to make headway by competition rather than by combination; for, while one employer is engaged in a desperate struggle with his men, the rest enhance their profits by getting the unlucky one's trade. Each employer is so hopeful of weathering the storm in his own case that combination among masters until a very recent period was quite impossible. Workmen, on the other hand, though suffering from dissension, have made steady progress in organizing and developing their strength. It is true the International failed, and it was well for all classes of society, but trade-unions are growing stronger every day and dealing blows with constantly augmenting force.

That workmen have often wrongly ascribed their victories to organization we shall hereafter give abundant proof. That they have reaped some benefit from organization, wrought immense havoc to business, sometimes without themselves profiting thereby, cannot be denied. Crude enough are the best of these organizations, not wisely directed, squandering their resources, and very slowly improving their methods. That they have risen to momentous consequence, the appointment of such a commission as that which inquired into the organization and rules of trade-unions and other associations of Great Britain in 1867 is conclusive, while the report of this commission redoubles the proof. That their power is feared, the steps finally taken among masters to combine for mutual safety leave no ground for dispute.

It cannot be maintained that the claims of labor are always just, nor that the methods workmen pursue to gain their ends are always in harmony with their own interests. Mr. Brassey has observed in his "Work and Wages" that workmen oftener strike to prevent a fall than to obtain a rise of wages; yet reductions are sometimes necessary, and employers have waited long after business ceased to be profitable before making them. It is because workmen so frequently war against their own interests that they perplex capital, and are driving it to despair. In 1869, a noted mechanic and locomotive-manufacturer of Saxony, Germany, stated in a letter to an English official that the trade-unions in Great Britain had produced the most pernicious results to English trade. To continue in his own language: "Not only have the engine-makers

been driven to German markets, but the same fate awaits them in the non-German markets; for example, in Russia, from whence large orders for railway works have come, and where they had to succumb to German and French firms." He also affirmed from his own experience that for a time no one ever ventured to give an order in England, as it was problematical whether the manufacturer would be in a condition to execute it, or whether the strikes would not occasion months of delay. We do not propose to treat in any lengthy way how the working classes injure their own interests through ignorance or prejudice; a single additional illustration will suffice. In Antwerp there were at one time nearly fifty establishments devoted to the manufacture of cigars, and employing about ten thousand workmen and apprentices. During the summer of 1871, all the operatives instituted a strike for the purpose of getting a reduction of working hours, though not of wages; and also of procuring a discharge of the apprentices. Concerning the justice of the first demand nothing need be said, but the latter demand was cruel, and the employers determined to resist it to the utmost. Means were furnished to the operatives so that the strike was prolonged for four months and a half, when work was resumed. In the mean time what had happened to the Antwerp cigar trade? It had received a serious blow from which it has never recovered. Those who had been accustomed to obtain a supply of cigars from this quarter went elsewhere when their demands could not be fulfilled, and have never returned. Trade is often slowly acquired, and quickly lost; and numer-



ous instances might be given of the blows inflicted upon it by workmen themselves who are the first to suffer from their short-sighted conduct.

Were workmen, whether single or united, studying only their own interests, but from an enlightened point of view, capital would not have much cause to fear. Unhappily, however well meant may be the efforts put forth by the laboring millions, they are deficient in wisdom and deeply immersed in prejudice, and are continually resorting to plans to improve their lot which are fraught not only with injury to themselves, but ruin to their masters. Too sanguine would be the hope of witnessing much improvement so long as their interests are regarded as opposed. Over and over again have workmen been told how identical were their interests with those of their employers. Instead, though, of growing in this belief, their enmity, as we have seen, is deepening every year. It would seem as though such disasters as the Antwerp cigar strike ought to teach a lesson worth remembering; but perhaps many repetitions must occur on a still grander scale before the working classes can behold the ruin they are bringing on their own heads.

Thus the antagonism between the two classes is great, and their relations are growing worse. Nor will it diminish until it is seen that the interests of capital and labor, instead of being opposed, are the same. Firmly established as is this principle in political economy, it must receive a practical acceptance before peace between the contending parties can be declared. To achieve this end, to make employer and employed recognize the truth of the identity of their

interests, and act accordingly, is a difficult and long-time task. But experiments have been tried in which the combination of interests was seen and acted upon, and these give considerable promise of success. Let us not believe that the antagonism is always to continue, but that, through much suffering and unsuccessful experiment, a solution of this great question will be reached,—a solution as perfect as it is likely to be costly, and more eagerly welcomed than a precious laden ship after a voyage long overdue.



## II.

THE SUPERABUNDANCE OF LABOR.

---

THE chief misfortune of the toiling multitude is self-caused, for, as the rate of wages is based upon the supply of labor, this is wholly within their control. Instead of regulating the supply by wisely restraining passion, it is often indulged most by those who can afford to do so least, and, consequently, a superabundance of labor is to be found in every long-civilized state. Having no accumulated resources, they are at the mercy of the employer; he can pay his own price, and, however low or unjust it may be, the laborers are plenty who are willing to take the places of the discontented. Not until a very recent period have workmen been able to enforce any concession from their employers; and even now the latter could crush the growing pride of the other class by adopting its tactics.

Labor may be out of employ for two reasons—either from the disturbance of trade, or from a superabundant supply. For example, in 1865 an extraordinary stimulus was given to the glass industry of Venice, and a great extension in this business arose. The demand for labor exceeded the supply, and wages increased so much that all who could abandoned their

occupations for bead-making. Three years later, clouds gathered over Venice; the demand for Venetian beads ceased, and a large number of persons no longer found employment. Shoemakers, tailors, carpenters, and like persons who had been attracted to the bead-manufacture by high wages, would gladly have returned to their former pursuits, but these were filled with new comers. The distress arising from depression in the business has not even yet passed away.

Fifty years ago the linen industry of Middle Silesia was in a very flourishing condition. In an evil hour for the workers of this thriving region, Frederick William III., refusing to acknowledge Queen Isabella of Spain, unwittingly struck a death-blow to this industry, for the Spanish market was closed against the importation of linen, and the Spaniards were the chief customers of Germany. From this blow the linen-manufacture of Silesia has never recovered, and thousands of weavers have suffered severely ever since. Many of them engaged in cotton-weaving, but not having money enough to purchase new looms, they were obliged to work on credit, and so were kept at the feet of large manufacturing and commercial establishments which paid them the "lowest possible wages."

The industrial classes of no country are exempt from such calamities as overtook the Venetian and Silesian workmen. In the United States, their lot, as a general rule, is happier than in other lands, yet even here they witness periods of suffering. The panic of 1870 effected great changes in the prospects of the working people. The mania for railroad building suddenly ceased, and a large number of men were

dismissed from work; then the iron establishments suffered in turn, many were closed, or the quantity of work reduced, as well as wages. The wave swept over nearly all branches of business, with like results to employer and employed. Such things happen everywhere; no country is exempt.

Almost every country is subject to some local cause rendering the supply of work more or less precarious. Let us note some of these causes, and where they occur. To begin with Belgium, there is, above all things, a superabundance of workmen. The most densely populated country in Europe, and emigration beyond the seas rare in ordinary times, and still more so when commercial crises happen, great misery prevails among the poorer classes, because they can get no work, and, consequently, earn nothing to buy bread. How vast is the mass of unemployed persons, even when manufactures are in their normal state, may be learned from the fact that more than nine hundred thousand, or one-fifth of the population, have their names inscribed upon the lists of poor relief. No wonder, then, Belgium is such a formidable competitor in the international markets with her products, since she is so rich in industrial wealth.

Going farther north to Denmark, the land is surfeited with workmen. The excessive supply is due to the constant influx from Sweden and Germany. The former country being heavily overburdened, a portion of the excess is drained off into Denmark, whose own population is more than sufficient for her needs. Swedish mechanics or field laborers can travel for fifty cents to Denmark, and there earn higher wages

than at home, experiencing no difficulty in adapting themselves to the country and using its language. As for the German artisan who comes hither, his nationality sits lightly upon him, and he is easily metamorphosed into an inhabitant of the soil. With such an ever-crowding supply, who can paint the Danish operatives' condition save in gloomy colors? It has been recently affirmed that of ten old and decayed workmen, nine are obliged to go to the parish for relief. It is said that fifteen hundred and seventy-four persons were in the Copenhagen workhouse eight years ago, and one-half of them were artisans. During the same year, nearly every fourth inhabitant of Copenhagen received some kind of public relief. In the poor-quarter of Christianshaven, one-third, or five thousand people, were relieved by the parish; and probably twenty-five hundred more were assisted by private charity.

In Prussia, if the laboring classes fare better, their sufferings, nevertheless, are great. Within a recent period, small artisans and tradesmen have suffered an eclipse caused by increased facilities of communication and transportation introduced by railroads. Customers, instead of going to the small shops, which abound in the country, resort to the larger ones in the more populous towns, where greater variety can be found. These cut down the trade of the smaller shops still more by sending abroad commission agents who scour the country thoroughly in search of orders. For the same reason, the annual markets and fairs are sinking to decay. Hence, a universal cry is heard from the smaller tradesmen and artisans, of their

trade being overstocked and the labor market glutted. In order to live, they turn their hands to almost any kind of work they can find, although the larger portion still cling to their regular pursuits. Under such precarious conditions of labor, "it is not surprising," as an authoritative writer has remarked, "that perhaps half of the families of the artisan class live in comparative indigence." Fresh meat is an exceptional luxury with many of them, their household economy is of the humblest kind, and indulgence in spirituous drinks, even in moderation, beyond their means.

Although the supply of labor greatly exceeds the demand, another cause of the stagnation in trade is diminished consumption. Hence, while the laboring classes are most severely affected, manufacturers and tradesmen do not escape.

Incorporated with the German empire is the city, or rather republic, of Hamburg, containing a population of three hundred and fifteen thousand souls. What fact could mark more plainly the superabundance of labor in Hamburg than this: the laboring classes receive the highest wages paid in Germany, and their living is correspondingly better, yet during the last fifteen years nearly one million have emigrated from the ports of Hamburg and Bremen to the United States and other countries.

Were the pauper lists a correct indication of the number who cannot get work, most of the countries of Europe would furnish a heavy roll. But they do not always tell the truth, for, doubtless, some prefer to beg and be supported even when there is opportunity



to work and earn a livelihood. Still, these lists are very significant, and, in many cases, do not tell the whole story of the suffering endured by persons who are unable to find employment. Thousands, especially in Belgium, are supported by private charity, and their names never appear upon any public roll for relief. Keeping this fact in sight, the pauper lists more perfectly indicate the number who cannot labor for want of something to do, than some perhaps are inclined at first to believe.

Labor is severely suffering in France from another cause. The war with Germany wrought havoc to French industries, and many a workman found his supply of work suddenly, and perhaps forever, cut off. While the war was raging, factories both in France and Germany were very generally closed, and the energies of the two nations were bent upon the destruction of life, rather than upon its preservation. In the mean time, Belgium profited by the misfortunes of her neighbors. Owing to the inactivity of the French and German factories, the prices of cotton, wool, and flax declined, and the Belgian manufacturers purchased heavy stocks at low figures, while they obtained new markets for their products. When the war was concluded, large quantities of manufactured goods were supplied to France as well as to Germany. But depression to French industries did not end with the war. Belgium has continued to hold on to a considerable portion of her trade, for the French government, compelled to increase taxation, has freighted some of her industries so heavily that they cannot rise. Years will elapse before her production becomes

as great and profitable as before the war; and of all who suffer from this fearful calamity, the working classes suffer most.

The unsettled condition of the government is another weight upon the industries of the country, and affects unfavorably the supply of work; this, however, is a result of the war. Were all the losses, past and prospective, accruing to capital and labor from this terrible struggle computed in dollars, the sum would be enormous.

War is undoubtedly one of the greatest curses from which the laboring classes suffer; in European countries it may be questioned whether the supply of work has not been more seriously affected by this cause than by any other. Says M. Dauby, an eminent Belgian writer: "All the industrial crises in Belgium, if traced back to their origin, will find their source either directly or indirectly in war or its results." He recites this remarkable illustration, drawn from the history of the cotton crisis of Ghent in 1826:

During the month of February most of the factories stopped work, and one employing 500 hands was closed. The number of operatives still employed who averaged ten hours a day was 9107, and 1150 were without work. A fortnight later, in March, the latter number was increased to 1386, the average working hours of the 8865 still employed being nine and a half. Near the latter end of April 2367 operatives were out of employment, and by the middle of May the number swelled to 3000. At that time, therefore, only seven-tenths of the operatives were employed, and they, in consequence of a reduction of the working hours,

earned about three-fifths of their former wages, being employed from eight to nine hours a day instead of thirteen or fourteen, as they were during the golden period of the industry.

It is unnecessary to say any more upon this sad topic. The International, with all its startling principles and measures, felt the full significance of war and armed peace to the workmen, for its enormous force was directed against standing armies and human bloodshed. This was one of the two foundation-stones upon which the society was built, and this was one reason why the governments of Europe marked it for destruction.

The working class of the United States is less exposed to suffering from this cause than is that of Europe. It is free from national jealousy, for no other nation of importance is near. Over the sea the contiguity of states and the existence of large standing armies thirsting for glory and conquest render peace a precarious thing at all times. Still, the people of the United States have suffered from internal dissensions, the evil consequences of which will long remain. One of the bitterest fruits was the creation of a paper currency, the circulation of which has been a heavier tax to the laborer than any other arising from the war. In consequence of this currency the prices of all commodities rapidly rose, but the price of labor did not advance in parallel lines, as all know. This was the first loss, but a second has continued longer; for, in consequence of the fluctuations caused by the currency, every one charged more for what he sold to cover any loss that might accrue. In other words, a sort of in-



surance premium was added to cover possible losses. And then, after the currency had grown superabundant, it flowed off into new channels of enterprise; the construction of railroads before they were required, and the like, stimulating the demand for labor during a short period; for quickly the bubble burst, hundreds of enterprises were stopped, thousands were dismissed from work, and all trade was shaken or destroyed. Even yet recovery is far from complete.

Notwithstanding the hard knocks labor has received in the United States, it is the most promising of all lands for the son of toil. The remark of Mr. Ford is unquestionably true that "to no quarter of the globe can a man turn with so reasonable a chance of finding work as to the United States of America." In the older, more thickly-settled portions of the land, the supply is quite equal to the demand, but the great prairies of the West invite the laborer to come hither, assuring to him a livelihood, if nothing more. No starving multitudes are found in the United States; and there is no excuse for beggary or destitution, provided the laborer has health. Of course, every country has its drones, and so has this. Nevertheless, Nature has richer gifts to bestow upon the man of industry in this quarter of her vast domain than in any other. True, she does not give everything, and those who come hither expecting to pick up gold in the streets will be disappointed. Gold does not grow on bushes nor wheat in barns; to get either requires effort. But there is an immense difference between the opportunity to earn one's bread if he desires, and not being able because there is no chance.

For the sufferings of its people every country has some compensation which no other can grant. Thus, in fleeing to the United States the emigrant leaves friends, amusements, and associations of various kinds, —a deprivation not easily borne. Many there are who prefer the garrets or cellars of cities, subsisting upon the coarsest and poorest food, to sweet, smiling valleys or broad, rich prairies, where a healthy living can be easily obtained, for the sole reason that they cannot part with their friends, their amusements, and the excitement of city life. Social wants, family ties and patriotic associations often rise superior to the cravings of the body, else emigration from over-crowded countries would be far more rapid.

The following illustration vividly illustrates the foregoing idea. The hand-loom weavers of Urach, a village in Wurtemberg, Germany, have outlived their day as fully as the battlements and towers which buttress their habitations. These are of two stories, greatly reduced in number, for the frames upon which the weavers work have been reduced from one hundred to twenty-one within the memory of men living. The busy factories, by giving greater and surer earnings, have drawn away the younger generations from the employment of their fathers. Entering the houses, a narrow stair leads to the room above, where a great amount of preparatory work is done by the female members of the household. On the ground-floor, or more frequently in the region beneath, are placed four or five looms; two or more friends or relations occupying the cave for mutual warmth and solace. It is said that not unfrequently work is fur-

nished them by old-fashioned persons, women who are still without faith in machinery, and refuse to depart from the ways of the past. Such an one will purchase her raw material, or cultivate it in her field, and afterwards, hunting out among the villages of the Alb an antiquated crone with a spinning-wheel, will employ her during the winter to spin the flax into yarn by hand. This done, she goes in the summer-time to Urach and makes a bargain with her weaver that her hand-spun may be hand-woven, declaring that, if she can help it, no machine-made fabric shall ever be worn by herself. These poor weavers, working fourteen hours a day, earn but a scanty pittance, and while the wages of the common laborer have increased fifty per cent. within twenty years, theirs have risen only twenty-six. At present, a weaver with the aid of his wife, reckoned at three hours more per day, making seventeen for both, will receive for that time thirty-two cents; though in a factory hard by they "could scarcely earn less, do what they might, than fifty-eight cents between them in exchange for twelve hours' labor." Why, then, do these haggard weavers remain during the livelong days in unfloored cellars, many of which are never heated, not even in keen mid-winter, when the doors of the factory are open to them? This is the answer: To maintain independence of all but self-imposed rules and routine, emancipation from all other masters but self; the breathing of a purer, less crowded air, free from dust and steam and ceaseless din; the power, whether used or not, to go and come at will; to shorten to-day's task and lengthen to-morrow's, or to exchange, at times, the weary sittings altogether for a

week's apple-gathering or field-labor; last, but not least, strong inherited habit, prejudice, association, and tradition,—these are the influences which keep the gaunt weavers in the flagging ranks, and nerve them to the pitiless contest, leaving the young and lusty to do homage, if they will, to the new power of the crank and wheel.\*

This illustration reveals to some extent the grave difficulties checking industrial progress. Inherited associations, ideas, habits, prejudices, cannot be buried in a day, and new experiments as quickly begun. These are never tried by the poorer classes when they can be avoided. Rash as they sometimes are, it is not so with the most ignorant and dependent. Hence, while the superabundance of labor in Europe might be drained off into other lands, to the obvious good of those going as well as those remaining, emigration is comparatively slow. Not until education steals in more brightly upon the toiling masses, quickening them with a new courage for improving their lot in other lands and by other occupations than those inherited, making them willing to sacrifice some things in order to gain more, can we hope that labor will find its proper home and reward.

---

\* "Factories for the Spinning and Weaving of Textile Fabrics abroad," p. 218.

## III.

HOW THE WORKING CLASSES ARE AFFECTED BY  
A RISE IN PRICES.

---

ALL over the world an increase of prices has taken place; the farthest nation has felt the rising wave. The price of labor in China, it is asserted, has doubled in several things within a recent period; while her products exported are far more costly than formerly. It is a very interesting, though difficult, inquiry to ascertain how the industrial classes have been affected by these changes, for not only must the advance in the price of labor be known, but of everything for which workmen spend their earnings. To find out how much wages have advanced is a useless inquiry; their purchase-power must be ascertained before a deduction of any value can be made, like answering the question whether the working classes are better off in these changeful times.

As mankind universally are trying to get advantages of one another, a common way of securing them is to enhance the price of all things offered for sale. Of course, we do not mean to assert that a person can arbitrarily put any price he pleases upon his commodities with the expectation of selling them, but only, as he can control to some extent their price, he uses that



power to dispose of his property to the best advantage. Protection against a rise of prices is sought in the same manner; hence, if a workman asks a higher price for his labor, his employer puts the excess upon the purchaser. This protection runs over a community, not suddenly, like a current of electricity, but as surely, until it embraces almost everything offered for sale. The workman, therefore, who is expecting to be a great gainer by an advance of wages, often sees his expectations turned into a delusion, for the additional reward must be paid to landlords and shopkeepers, because they have raised their prices. In the readjustment of prices it often happens that the condition of the industrial classes is rendered worse, instead of better, by the change, as we shall abundantly prove before concluding this chapter. The reason is, because the unfortunate son of toil is placed at a disadvantage with almost every other class in controlling the price for his labor. The employer, the merchant, the carrier,—all have a greater command over what they sell than the man working for his daily bread has over the product of his toil.

How, then, are the working classes affected by the advance in the price of labor and the necessities of life? Are they gainers or losers by the change?

Let us look at their condition, first, in the Netherlands. For several years prior to 1872 there had been a continual rise of prices in the necessities of life, but not in labor. This rise had become so serious, that a committee composed of twelve members,—four ordinary workmen, four masters, and four indirect employers of labor,—who were appointed in January, 1870,

reported, at the end of three months' examination, that, notwithstanding the narrow limits within which household expenses were kept, in every case they considerably exceeded the nominal wages of the head of the family. That our readers may know what kind of food was thought of in estimating these expenses, we will note that no meat, save a very small quantity of bacon, was allowed, and no liquor, not even beer. The average necessities of an ordinary skilled workman with a family were reckoned at nine florins, or three dollars and seventy-five cents, per week, while his average wages did not exceed six florins and sixty cents, or two dollars and seventy-five cents, during the same period. If he belonged to a lower class, his average wages never exceeded four florins and eighty cents per week. Thus, in the former case, there was a deficit of one dollar, and in the latter, of one dollar and seventy-five cents, which must be provided for by working out of the regular hours, or by the aid of the wife or children. With this dark coloring the report of the committee may be anticipated. Within the district of Arnheim, where the inquiry was made, they declare the average rate of wages "was not in proportion to the cost of the necessities of life; in other words, that wages were too low."

In the consular report of Mr. Newham, for Amsterdam, to the British government, the following year, he says there had been a general rise of wages during the last few months previous to the making of his report, in April, 1872,—another illustration of a well-known truth, that, in a general rise of prices, wages are the last to advance.

To their credit be it said, employers had anticipated the wishes of their workmen and increased their wages before hearing any complaint from them.

The wages of a skilled artisan, like a carpenter, joiner, plumber, or smith, in 1869, were only about four dollars a week; while his wife, if having one, earned, perhaps, seventy-five cents or one dollar more by washing, and her husband twenty-five or fifty cents in addition to his regular wages, the united earnings of a family amounting perhaps to five dollars and fifty cents per week. Men whose trade or occupation required less skill were not so well paid unless the labor was more severe, like that of the stokers in the gas works at the Hague, who were paid four dollars and thirty-seven cents a week. To earn this much they were obliged to work twelve hours daily seven days in the week, with an additional six hours every Saturday.

Notwithstanding the rise in wages, the question remains unanswered, How do the Dutch laborer and his family succeed in fighting off starvation? This is accomplished, but in a manner which would seem heroic to the ordinary laboring man in the United States. To the industrial classes of Holland, animal food, cheese, eggs, beer, currants, raisins, sugar, etc., are luxuries of which they partake only on Sundays, and then sparingly, oftentimes not at all. Their food is chiefly vegetable,—carrots, turnips, onions, cabbage, etc., stewed with lard and bread, both wheat and rye. When vegetables cannot be obtained, they vary their meal by substituting dried peas and beans of various kinds, or rice, barley, and flour prepared with butter, milk, and treacle.

Such is a brief outline of the working-man's condition



in Holland. Does his fate seem a hard one? One who studied carefully their condition declares that the "native working classes are doubtless in a comfortable and contented state, poverty is rare, destitution almost unknown; and this is to be attributed chiefly to the national character, to steady life, and thrifty ways." Out of such meagre earnings the Hollander can get comfort and contentment: happier far would it be for other countries were their people endowed with similar characteristics.

From the Netherlands we pass to Belgium. Within the boundaries of this little country numerous strikes have occurred recently, and dissatisfaction and unrest mark the conduct of the working population. Notwithstanding a recent rise of wages in Antwerp, of thirty per cent., the condition of the laboring classes is pitiful enough. According to the best authority, the standard of wages in Belgium for all kinds of labor is insufficient to satisfy the legitimate wants of the laboring population. The average daily wages of a mill operative do not exceed two francs, or about forty cents, and, excluding Sundays, holidays, and other days when he remains idle for want of work or from inclination, his working days will rarely number two hundred and fifty in the year, so that the amount earned will not exceed five hundred francs, or one hundred dollars, yearly, which is eight dollars and forty cents a month, and two dollars and twenty-five cents per week. Suppose the case of a married operative earning this sum, and having a wife and three children, one child earning one franc, or twenty cents, a day, in addition, the income of such a family would be three

dollars and twenty cents a week. The expenses of these five persons, calculated at the lowest rate, will be the following :

	FRANCS.
Bread.....	5.25
Potatoes.....	2.10
Coffee and chicory.....	2.00
Vegetables.....	2.00
Butter.....	1.00
Clothing.....	2.00
Washing, soap, etc.....	1.00
Rent.....	2.00

---

17.35 = \$3.47

No mention is made of beer, meat, or sugar ; nothing but the absolute necessities of life. Remove one of the number, or add one-third to the wages of the operative, and yet it is almost impossible for him to maintain his family. This is by no means an over-drawn statement. " Probably ten thousand or twenty thousand working-men's households in Belgium are in this sad position."\*

Some workmen, it is true, break through the thick, hard crust covering them. In Brussels, for example, a good carpenter, working for himself, and having a few dollars of capital or credit to buy wood, can earn from one dollar to one dollar and fifty cents a day, and get all the work he can perform. As soon as his income will admit, he rents a small house, in which his wife begins a little shop. Ultimately her husband becomes a master carpenter, making contracts for the construction of buildings. To obtain this position is

---

\* Mr. Grattan, "Ind. Classes," 1872, p. 18.

the dream of the lesser bourgeois. In the domestic trades the journeyman, as a rule, is either young or improvident and cannot set up for himself. Such being his financial position, it is hardly necessary to allude to the poverty of his living,—little or no meat, inferior bread, with grease, potatoes, vegetable soup, and floods of weak coffee and chiccory form the cheap diet in towns. Their lodgings are simply deplorable: they herd together in the most dismal streets of the great cities, or crowd the damp hovels which surround the country towns and the pitmouth. Their dwellings are as fine a field for epidemics of every description as it is possible to conceive, for they are rarely able to afford more than one room, to which lodgers are frequently admitted. Mr. Pakenham says, in reviewing the condition of the Belgian laborer: "The inferior hand in all trades is, as a rule, unable to live on his wages; that he is badly fed and clothed, ill housed, and that he cares for little beyond his periodical orgies; faring, however, slightly better in the country than in the towns." The superior workman, he adds, "gets fair wages, is decently fed, and well lodged;" but this class, unhappily, is small compared with the other.

Even when manufacturers are the most prosperous, there is a superabundance of labor, so that wages remain low in comparison with other things. Hence, in times of usual prosperity, great misery prevails among the laboring population, widening and deepening during periods of commercial distress. The names of more than nine hundred thousand persons, or one-fifth of the population, are inscribed upon the list of poor relief; a fact sadly illustrative of the privations

and sufferings experienced in a land whose manufacturing and industrial wealth is so great. Of course, this excessive supply of labor, especially among the lower classes of society, will maintain pretty nearly level the rate of wages. The rate has risen within a few years, but not in proportion to the things necessary to sustain life. This being so, the observation of Mr. Pakenham ought not to go unheeded, "that too much haste can hardly be made in finding a remedy for evils which, in the future, may become very serious as regards the tenure of property and the maintenance of public order."

Consider for a moment the condition of the brick-makers, who, in the district of Charleroi, number nearly seven thousand. About six thousand leave in the fine season to work in France, where the business of brickmaking begins in April and lasts until September,—extending over a period of five months. The work is mostly performed by hand, machinery being either unknown or disliked. The food of these laborers consists of second quality bread, one pound of butter and the same quantity of meat per week, without soup save on Sundays. For drink, each man is furnished with two litres of beer a day; and they are lodged in sheds, both drink and lodging being given by the employers. The men earn about one dollar and ten cents a day, but deducting forty cents for food and the expense of going and coming, the sum remaining for the support of the family is exceedingly small. Yet even this much pay is given with the expectation that the workman will not stop for any cause; and if, in case of sickness or other accident, he



cannot be immediately replaced, the loss falls equally upon those working with him, because the ordinary task cannot be finished. In respect to the boys employed, they earn only one-quarter of these wages, and barely keep off starvation. During absence from home their wives care for the children, do some farm-work, while the larger number are engaged in making nails by hand. The men, also, upon returning home, chiefly engage in the same occupation, at which they make, with great difficulty, working from five in the morning until eight in the evening, thirty cents a day. At the end of each working-season, after paying the debts incurred during their absence by their wives and children, and for their clothing, they have exhausted all their resources, and, having no reserve fund to use in the event of illness or want of work, are thrown upon the charities of the public. This example shows how a single class of workmen in a particular district live. Did time and space permit, many more might be given.

In 1855 a work was prepared by the Minister of the Interior of Belgium, relating to the financial position of the working classes of the country, based upon returns furnished officially to the government by the local authorities in each province. Detailed estimates of the means of living and the necessary expenditure of the working population were given, the people being divided into three classes as follows:

First, families partly supported by public charity; secondly, those hardly able to meet their expenses, but not dependent upon public relief; and thirdly, those whose means enabled them to live comfortably,

and who might be considered entirely independent. A family of each class, consisting of father, mother, and four children, two, six, twelve, and sixteen years of age respectively, were taken as examples for each important section of country or locality. The returns in the table herewith given for Antwerp are most striking :

PARISH.	CLASS.	NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT.	RECEIPTS.	NECESSARIES OF LIFE.	PUBLIC WORSHIP, SCHOOLING, ETC.	AMUSEMENTS, LUXURIES, ETC.	TOTAL.	DEFICIT.	SURPLUS.
Berlaer .....	1	Navy .....	\$81.80	\$30.00	.....	\$1.67	\$81.67	.....	\$0.13
" .....	2	Weaver .....	128.00	122.65	\$1.00	4.09	127.74	.....	.26
" .....	3	Carpenter.....	252.00	201.60	3.80	24.95	230.35	.....	21.65
Eekeren .....	1	Ag. Laborer...	141.00	134.76	3.38	4.94	143.08	\$2.08	.....
Gheel .....	1	" .....	152.60	159.05	.....	3.12	162.17	9.57	.....
" .....	2	" .....	203.96	175.66	1.50	4.16	181.32	.....	22.64
" .....	3	" .....	338.26	317.39	7.40	4.72	329.51	.....	8.75
Houtstraeten ..	1	" .....	82.00	118.17	.....	3.53	121.70	39.70	.....
" .....	3	" .....	191.73	179.59	4.92	7.32	191.83	.10	.....

From this table it will be seen that only one belonging to the first class showed any surplus; the two returns from the second class were favorable; as were two out of the three instances given of the expenditures and earnings of the third class. But in all the cases, excepting two, the surplus is small, and quickly covered by any additional expense like sickness or want of work.

This brief presentation of the condition of the laboring classes in Belgium must necessarily be incomplete, but we think enough facts have been given to enable the reader to form some conception of industrial life in that country.

From the ill-starred population of Belgium we will go to Germany. Here the field of inquiry is so vast that nothing can be done, save to glance here and there at the condition of the industrial classes. Still, we are desirous of lingering long enough to form a tolerably complete idea of the rise in the price of food and in wages in this newly-created empire.

Wages in Prussia did not vary much for fifteen years from 1840,\* although the price of living had doubled

\* By way of illustrating the wages paid in cotton- and woolen-factories we have collected the following figures :

	1839.	1855.	1871.
Spinners.....	\$1.87	\$1.50	\$1.37
Spoolers.....	.64	.66	.....
Drawing-Frame tenders.....	.64	.....	.....
Pickers (girls).....	.57	.56	.81
Winders.....	.63	.75	.....
Strippers (girls).....	.....	.85	1.12
Spinning overseer.....	.. ..	3.75	3.75
Picker overseer.....	.....	2.87	.....
Carding overseer.....	.....	.....	3.75

These were the weekly wages paid in a Saxon spinning-factory during the several periods indicated. The following prices were paid for labor in a factory near Berlin, in which plush and woolen goods were made :

	1862.	1867.	1872.
Overseers.....	\$4.50 to 6.00	\$5.25 to 7.50	\$6.00 to 9.00
Best hands.....	4.50 to 5.25	5.25 to 6.00	6.00 to 6.75
Ordinary.....	2.25	3.00	3.75



within that time. Since 1855 wages have risen about twenty-five per cent. in nearly all employments, though this is by no means a proportionate advance to the increased cost of living, as statistics prove. The condition of the laboring classes, therefore, has grown worse, rather than better, during this period.

The wages of factory operatives are high enough, in most cases, to support single persons comfortably; and, provided they are of a saving disposition, they can lay up something; but wages are insufficient to support a family. To do this one member or more, besides the husband, must work. The operatives in the eastern provinces of Prussia get higher wages than those in the western, while the expense of living in all is quite the same. The weavers of Berlin are among those who reap the smallest reward for their labor. Of the three thousand weavers, working twelve hours a day, one-fifth earn three dollars per week; one-quarter, two dollars and sixty-two cents; another quarter, who do inferior work, two dollars and twenty-five cents; while the remaining thirty per cent. earn one dollar and eighty-seven cents only. In one of the larger manufacturing districts of Prussia, Lower Silesia, slight relief is given to this deplorable picture. Some German authorities, quoted by Mr. Petrie in his report to the British government upon the industrial classes in Prussia, affirm that their condition for several years has been improving, and that wages are sufficient to satisfy the requirements of their mode of living. Herr Jacobi says that throughout the industrial districts there was a deficiency in the supply of labor, which he attributes to the strides made by agri-

culture and manufactures within the last ten years in Lower Silesia, and to a change in the law respecting the freedom of labor, as well as to increased facilities for the distribution of labor. As a consequence of this improved demand, wages have risen, and in some districts within the circle of Hirschberg fifty per cent. in five years. The erection of a manufactory at Luben, where none had existed before, caused a rise from twelve to eighteen cents a day for men, and the wages of women, who had received previously from agricultural labor only six cents a day, were doubled. Yet how small are these wages compared with those paid in England, and especially in the United States!

In Saxony, with the exception of fixed salaries, the average rate of wages paid weekly has increased very considerably during the last decade. The rise corresponds to the higher price for food, clothing, house-rent, and other wants of life. Nor is the rise owing to the greater productiveness, skill, or capacity of the workmen. At present there is strong competition between the country and city tailors of Leipzig. The wages of the latter in 1859 were, for making a vest, thirty-five cents; pants, fifty-six cents; coat, one dollar and eighty-seven cents; and frock-coat, two dollars. In 1864 these rates had been changed to the following: vest, fifty cents; pants, sixty-two cents; coat, two dollars and twenty-five cents; and frock-coat, two dollars and sixty-two cents. And in 1870 wages had been still further enhanced: thus, vest, sixty-two cents; pants, sixty-eight cents; coat, two dollars and seventy-five cents; and frock-coat, three dollars. A very considerable increase within eleven years.

How fares the operative in the kingdom of Saxony? At the Pfaffendorf woolen and worsted factory in Leipzig four hundred hands are employed. Piece-work is the rule, and the rates earned are as follows:

	Per week.
Master spinner.....	\$3.00
Females .....	1.00
Combing-machine hands .....	1.25
Sorters (male).....	2.25
Sorters (female) .....	1.25
Washers (male) .....	3.00
Washers (female).....	1.25
Women of all work.....	1.43

That this scale of wages is very low and presupposes excessive frugality in living is so apparent that nothing need be said. The women chiefly live upon weak coffee, often made from roasted barley or from grounds bought in hotels and taverns. Many of the working-men of Saxony cannot earn five dollars a week. Suppose one capable of acquiring so much, how can he maintain a family consisting of a wife and four children? Here are the figures:

House-rent .....	\$0.62
Washing.....	.12
Firing.....	.25
Lighting.....	.12
Clothing.....	.43
Schooling.....	.15
Early coffee, bread per head.....	.26
Breakfast, bread per head.....	.81
Dinner, per head.....	1.03
Vespers, four o'clock bread .....	.43
Supper, per head.....	.53
Coffee, roasted barley or acorns.....	.18

---

\$4.93

The reply to the above inquiry, How can such a family live? is, what the husband does not earn must be made up by his wife; and if she be unable to do this the household gets into debt. Something is sometimes gained by letting one or two beds at the rate of twenty-five cents per week, but this is a precarious source of income. The unmarried man, however, is well enough off, for his weekly reckoning would be something like this:

House-rent.....	\$0.25
Washing.....	.12
Firing .....	.25
Lighting.....	.05
Clothing.....	.50
Food.....	1.12
	<hr/>
	\$2.29

Hence, he can live better, spend more for his clothes, and save money for evil days.

Passing into Wurtemberg, from 1830 to 1869 there has been a steady increase both in wages and in number of manufactories, which began to flourish at the opening of this period. Prior to this time but few existed. According to the table found in the appendix, the average increase in the rate of wages in eight branches of industry during forty years was nearly seventy per cent.; in two cases the increase drops to sixty per cent.; while the wages of printers have gone up to fifty-two per cent. The percentage of increase in the cotton-spinning establishments was fifty-seven, and for paper-making one hundred per cent. more. The rise to seventy-seven per cent. in the pianoforte



manufactories is accounted for by the extraordinary development of this branch of manufacture, which demands skilled workmen, and also by the increased cost of living, especially in the larger towns where this industry is the principal one. With respect to the wages of dyers and tanners, an increase of fifty per cent. has been observed, while the wages of masons, bricklayers, carpenters, and painters have risen eighty to ninety per cent., owing to the unusual activity in the building trade during the last dozen years, especially at the capital. Sixty-nine per cent. may be taken as the general average increase in the daily wages for open-air labor on the roads and the like. The rates differ much in various parts of the country, having increased fifty per cent. in some, in other places doubled.

On the other hand, the cost of living has increased, but not, upon the whole, in proportion to wages, so that the material condition of the operative has greatly improved during the last thirty-five years. The following table concerning the price of food will enable the reader to judge for himself:

	WHEAT.	RYE.	BARLEY.	SPELT.	BEEF.	PORK.	VEAL.
1833.....	\$4.41	\$3.18	\$2.83	\$1.95	\$0.05 ½	\$0.05	\$0.04
1836.....	3.93	2.64	2.81	1.68	.05 ½	.05	.05 ½
1842.....	6.04	3.25	3.00	2.60	.06	.05	.04 ½
1856.....	7.75	5.25	4.33	3.10	.08	.08	.07
1859.....	5.75	3.75	4.25	2.37	.09 ½	.09	.08
1865.....	5.37	3.75	3.70	2.25	.10	.10	.07 ½
1869.....	5.37	3.75	3.70	2.25	.12	.12	.08 ½

From this survey of the condition of the laborer in Wurtemberg, compared with the condition of those

in the neighboring provinces, he has some reason for feeling contented with his lot. Recently house-rents have rapidly advanced in Stuttgart, but houses are multiplying which, though of the flimsiest description, will effect a reduction of rents.

The contiguity of Wurtemberg to other provinces where labor may be found in great abundance must lead to immigration, so that the advantages now enjoyed by the toilers there will soon pass away. The condition of the Wurtemberg laborer is too superior to be lasting.

Near to Wurtemberg is the Grand Duchy of Baden, in which country a considerable rise of wages has taken place within a recent period. Since 1863 the advance in some occupations has been forty per cent. For example:

	MALES. Per cent.	FEMALES. Per cent.
Cotton-spinning mills.....	12	20
Cotton-weaving mills.....	25	33
Cigar-factories.....	14	14
Iron-foundries.....	...	15
Hemp-factories.....	36	...
Cotton-printing .....	13	...
Button.....	7	11
Leather.....	40	...
Mechanical.....	32	...
Umbrella.....	...	12
Silk.....	...	15

As wages have risen more rapidly than the prices of the necessaries of life, "their condition is good or better than it has been at any previous period."

Saxe Coburg, one of the smaller German states,

has passed through one of the most extraordinary changes of any state in Europe. Within a few years wages have risen from fifty to one hundred per cent., while the price of food has remained nearly the same. Nevertheless, the working classes fare poorly in respect to food. Bread and potatoes are the chief articles. They never eat meat unless they can afford to keep a pig,—a marked contrast to the living of laborers in the United States and Great Britain.

Quitting the German empire, we will glance at the condition of the working classes in Denmark. Like all other countries, wages, especially for skilled workmen, have risen, though not in proportion to the advance in food and rent. These latter things have gone up nearly forty per cent. since 1850. The price of labor is somewhat higher at Copenhagen than in the country; and notwithstanding the fact that rents are lower outside than within the capital, the workman is better off in the city. A provincial artisan who lives with his master gets two dollars and twenty-five cents a week, with board and lodging. The average daily wages received in Jutland by navvies who used their own tools in 1865, for the summer months, were fifty-four cents a day, and for all the year thirty-seven cents. The next year wages were higher on account of the greater demand for labor, being nearly seventy-five cents a day during the summer, and the yearly average sixty cents. In 1868 wages were still advancing, for the summer being eighty-one cents, and for the year sixty cents, as much as they received at any time during 1865. But note the change which took place the next year. In March, 1869, hardly thirty-



seven cents per day was paid, and only the best hands could obtain work even at that reduced price. The condition, therefore, of Danish workmen is not an enviable one. Elsewhere\* we have given a picture of their state.

Next we shall deal with the industrial classes of Austria. In 1869 the average yearly wages of an agricultural laborer were fifteen to twenty dollars; and the wages of women two-thirds to three-fourths of these figures. This remuneration, however, is in addition to board and lodging. Generally, the laborer is well fed, and this circumstance has given rise to the proverb: "What the plough makes, the ploughman takes." Owing to the general rise of prices and the construction of railways, the rate of wages for agricultural labor during several years has risen considerably throughout the empire, and is likely to continue, as the demand for this kind of labor is greater than the supply. Having no data for showing what the rise has been in the wages of other laborers, we must be content with tabulating the present rates without any reference to what they formerly were.

Italy has followed in the wake of other countries in advancing the price of labor and other things. Thus, in 1861, according to the statistical returns for the province of Parma, workmen in the various trades were paid the following average rates :

Woolen-, silk-, and cotton-weavers.....	\$0.20
Ropemakers.....	.20
Hatters .....	.29

Tailors .....	\$0.32
Shoemakers.....	.40
Iron- and copper-founders.....	.42
Coopers.....	.25
Paper-makers.....	.28
Printers.....	.27

Since then, wages have risen in some trades fifty per cent., though it is difficult to obtain the advance with exactness. The following table shows the rise in the price of labor at Verviers, in the Province of Vicenza, where are extensive woolen-mills. The table includes the price of labor in other parts of Italy for 1868:

		VERVIERS.				ITALY.
		1836.	1846.	1856.	1863.	1868.
Sorters .....	Women.	\$0.20	\$0.24	\$0.34	\$0.37	\$0.17
Rinsers.....	.....	.28	.29	.32	.52	.34
Carders.....	.....	.18	.20	.26	.30	.35
Spinners.....	.....	.36	.38	.58	.67	.62
Scourers.....	.....	.29	.35	.46	.65	.50
Warpers.....	Women.	.16	.19	.31	.33	.20
Weavers.....	.....	.40	.54	.57	.60	.52
Fullers.....	.....	.28	.34	.35	.46	.40
Finishers.....	Women.	.16	.20	.24	.34	.17
Carpenters .....	.....	.40	.40	.45	.55	.40
Smiths.....	.....	.40	.50	.50	.60	.50
Laborers .....	.....	.20	.25	.35	.40	.24

It will be observed that even the present rates are very low; on the other hand, house-rent, especially in the manufacturing districts, is cheap, being fifty per cent. less than in Belgium, while food is not so dear. As the habits of the Italian operative are frugal, and the climate mild, tending to diminish his wants, he is

better off than the Belgian operative,—better off even than workmen in some of the German states.

A few words concerning the laboring classes of Russia, and we will go to Switzerland. The reader may anticipate the remark that in this country, as in every other noticed, a general rise in prices has taken place. The tables given in the appendix exhibit very fully the advance in wages and provisions in Moscow during nine years from 1860 to 1869.

The increase in the chief articles of consumption during the last decade was nearly fifty per cent.; nevertheless, wages have risen in an equal, and, in many cases, greater proportion; so that the condition of the Russian artisan has improved very materially during recent years.

In regard to Switzerland, we regret not having the space to give a full history of its industrial classes, so fraught with instruction and moral beauty is the theme. Of all the nations of Europe, the people of Switzerland are the most content, the most intelligent, and the least immoral. The true relations subsisting between employed and employer are better understood there than in any other country in the world,—due chiefly to two facts: first, the universal education of the people; and secondly, the interest taken in the working classes by their masters. So that there, as in no other country, does a mutual good feeling prevail.

But we cannot speak of these things here without wandering from the central point of inquiry; namely, the advance in wages and the increased cost of living. The tables in the latter part of this volume answer the

question and show what the increase has been, and how the laborer is affected thereby.

Leaving Switzerland, we stop to note the condition of the industrial classes in France. In this, as in all great countries, there has been an agitation and unsettling of prices,—a state of things which will surely continue so long as the government, like a helpless infant, rests in the arms of one political party to-day and is snatched away by another to-morrow. With a population of nearly forty millions, for a long period France has been the birthplace of numerous social experiments, and of dazzling, but disastrous, ideas concerning the rights of man and the rewards of labor. Every one knows how deeply the doctrine of Communism has taken root in French soil, for the poisonous tree cast a fearful shade over Paris in 1871, causing the death of thousands, and the destruction of many of her noblest palaces and works of art. In 1863 the French government published an elaborate statistical work\* upon wages in France, which presented the condition of French workmen in the most favorable light possible. This document, however, fails to give the price of wages later than 1857 for the provinces, and 1853 for Paris. Since then, wages in the capital have risen about twenty-five per cent., while the price of food is forty per cent. higher than it was in 1855; the work in question, therefore, cannot be appealed to for the latest information on the subject. Some observations contained in the report afford a glimpse of the condition of the industrial classes, and these will not

---

\* *Statistique de la France, Deuxième Série, tom. xii. p. 24.*

be out of place here. "The examination of the increase of wages, proved by documents of charitable institutions running over thirty-two years, may be summed up in the remark that, while the price of living has increased forty-five per cent., wages (at least for workmen engaged in the building trade, the most regularly paid and the most actively employed) have only increased seventeen per cent., and this increase has only taken place of late years under the double influence of great and prolonged dearness, and an active demand for work." This disproportionate increase in the expense of living to the price of labor applies equally to all the workmen engaged in the minor industries. The observation quoted, which cannot be regarded as a very favorable one for the working classes, is slightly relieved by the consideration that notwithstanding an increased consumption of clothing and furniture, these things have declined in price. The workman is, therefore, better and more warmly clad, and his furniture is more comfortable than formerly. This was declared to be especially true of workmen in the larger towns, where competition stimulates industrial activity and fosters cheapness. On the other hand, the advantage they possess over country workmen is neutralized by the heavier rents demanded in the larger centres of population.

The condition of agricultural laborers is no better. They are divided into two classes,—the farm-laborer, who is employed by the year and lives upon the farm, and the day-laborer, whose employment is by the day. The former class receive, in addition to food and clothing, wages partly in money and the rest in kind.



The average yearly wages of the farm-laborer are one hundred and forty-five francs, or twenty-nine dollars, while the value of the kind is estimated throughout France at twenty-six francs, or five dollars and twenty cents; so the entire yearly wages of the farm-laborer, exclusive of food and lodging, are thirty-four dollars and twenty-five cents. This seems an exceedingly small sum for a laboring man to receive.

The day-laborer earns, upon an average, thirty-five cents per day,—the highest being fifty cents, in the Department of the Seine; and the lowest twenty-three cents, in the Côtes du Nord. His average amount of work is two hundred days in the year. The daily pay of a woman in the agricultural districts is seventeen cents, that of children twelve and a half cents; the former works one hundred and twenty days in the year, the children eighty. Their food and lodging are valued at thirty-six dollars and sixty cents a year. Supposing the above figures to be correct, the day-laborer earns three hundred and fifty francs, or seventy dollars; a woman one hundred and two francs, or twenty dollars and forty cents; and a child eighty francs, or sixteen dollars, during the year. These figures are taken from the *Statistique Agricole Officielle*, and in the same document are calculations made respecting the expenses of a day-laborer, single and married. Let us consider the single man's case first: His food is reckoned at two hundred and thirty, lodgings twenty-seven, and clothing forty-five, francs; making a total of three hundred and two francs, or sixty dollars and forty cents; leaving forty-eight francs, or nine dollars and sixty cents, for other expenses or



investment. Regarding him as able to take care of himself, look at a family consisting of a day-laborer, his wife, and three children. The items of expenditure may be put down as follows:

Lodgings.....	\$8.40
Bread .....	47.00
Vegetables.....	7.20
Meat.....	8.40
Milk.....	4.80
Wine and beer.....	6.80
Salt.....	1.50
Clothing.....	18.20
Firing.....	6.40
Taxes.....	1.09
Other expenses.....	6.40
	<hr/>
	\$116.19

To live in this manner all the members of the family must work, as the following table will prove :

	FRANCS.	DOLLARS.
Man's wages.....	350 .....	70.00
Woman's wages.....	102 .....	20.40
Three children, at fifty francs each.....	150 .....	30.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	602	120.40

For, if all receive these wages, only a balance of four dollars and twenty-one cents will be left at the end of the year. When sickness happens, or the supply of work is diminished, it is easy to see how poor is the condition of such a family. It must be said, however, that a portion of the agricultural laborers of France, estimated at eight per cent., supplement their resources by the prosecution of some accessory industry,—such as weaving, wood-cutting, sawing,—by

which their wages are considerably increased, although they may not be able to work so many days at their regular employment in consequence.

In respect to the manufacturing population, a marked increase in the price of their labor may be noted, although the rates have varied much at different times and places. The *Statistique Officielle de l'Industrie*, in 1852, gave the following prices for labor in the manufacture of cotton goods :

Spinning-mill.....	\$0.39
Thread mill.....	.46
Braid mill.....	.46
Textures, calicoes, blankets, shawls, and prints...	.33
Lawn, cambric.....	.59
Stamped goods .....	.47

Between 1860 and 1870 the wages of cotton operatives rose thirty per cent. :

	1860.	1870.
Spinners.....	31½	39¼
Weavers.....	59½	73
Carders.....	34½	39¼
Winders.....	.....	.....
Men or women.....	25	39¼
Children .....	14½	25

In 1804, fifteen thousand five hundred pieces of cloth were manufactured at Elbeuf, and eighty-two thousand pieces in 1852. The cloth at the former period was made by hand, and sold for the average price of twenty francs the metre; the cloth produced in 1852 was manufactured by machinery, and, though selling for twelve francs a metre, was of better quality. The

wages of workmen in 1804 were twenty-four cents a day for men, women fifteen cents, and children four to six cents. In 1853 the average was fifty-five cents for men, women thirty-five cents, while children received eighteen cents per day. A writer, after noting these facts concerning the rise in the price of wages, observes: "The price of food rose at the same time; but even taking this into consideration, the rate of wages paid in the latter year was one-fourth higher than in the former."

In the way of further illustrating the rise in wages, let us note the changes which have occurred in the mines and forges under the direction of Messrs. Schneider & Co., at Le Creusot, who have nine thousand nine hundred and fifty persons in their employ. The mean rate of wages had risen, between the years of 1850 and 1866, from fifty to seventy-five cents a day, representing an increase of fifty per cent. In this establishment, however, great facilities are given to their employees, at the partial expense of the proprietors, for feeding, lodging, clothing, and educating themselves and their families, which are valuable additions to the income of the workmen. Seven hundred families, it is stated, are lodged by the company at fifty per cent. below the usual price of house-rent; and seven hundred gardens are let to them at the nominal rate of forty cents per annum.

Generally, it may be affirmed, there has been a rise of wages throughout France of forty per cent. during the last fifteen years; but the workman does not get much benefit from this rise, as his cost of living has greatly increased. Notwithstanding the higher prices

he must pay for house-rent, clothing, and all the necessities of life, a margin is left in his favor; and "to this extent," says a writer well qualified to speak, "there has been a rise in wages, which enables the laborer to feed, lodge, and clothe himself somewhat better than he could fifteen years ago.\*

Such, in brief, is the manner in which the French working classes are affected by the rise in wages and necessities of life. In some respects France has been less fortunate than her neighbors in maintaining peace, which is essential to the prosperity of any state. It is true that during the reign of Napoleon her material prosperity was greatly augmented, for her commerce, which in 1825 was valued at nine hundred million francs, one billion seven hundred million francs twenty years later, four billion francs in 1860, had risen in 1866 to six billion four hundred million francs; in short, her trade with foreign countries had increased sevenfold during the forty years previous to the date last mentioned. But war, with all its horrors, has smitten France; her government has been overthrown, and confusion, uncertainty, and distress are everywhere experienced. The laborer suffers most during the depressed period of a country's industry. As truly remarked in one of the documents of the French government relating to this subject: "That which is requisite for the welfare of the industrial classes is regular, constant, and certain wages rather than high wages accompanied by irregularity in the duration of the engagement." True, not much collision has

---

\* Julian Fane, "Correspondence with Her Majesty's Missions."

arisen between workmen and their employers, but this is due rather to ignorance than to satisfaction with their condition. In the readjustment of prices the workman of France, though benefited in some instances by the change, is in general reduced to a sorrier plight, and his future is without much hope.

As for the British laborer, although there has been an enormous increase of wealth in Great Britain within a quarter of a century, his remuneration in many cases has advanced but little, if at all. Mr. Brassey, in his "Work and Wages," handles this question with great care, and his conclusions are undoubtedly trustworthy, as he possessed unusual facilities for obtaining information. Some of his illustrations are worth repeating. For example, in the Canada Engineering Works at Birkenhead, thirteen classes of workmen are employed. In six of them, workmen received less wages in 1869 than in 1854; in three, the same; and four classes have had their wages increased. The government employs in the dockyard at Sheerness thirteen classes of workmen like shipwrights, calkers, etc. In three classes only were wages advanced between 1849 and 1859, and the greatest increase did not exceed sixpence a day; during the next decade wages were absolutely stationary in every class. At the private shipyards on the Thames wages rose from 1851 to 1865, yet four years later the advance had been wholly lost. The rise in 1865 was not lasting, for it was caused by speculation ending two years later in a panic. Trade then collapsed, thousands were shut out of employment, and the wages of the remainder were considerably reduced. Mr. Brassey has shown the greatest and most



permanent advance to have accrued to the workmen of the building trades in London and Manchester. Between 1853 and 1872 their wages were increased one-third, a very large addition.

On the other hand, the cost of living has rapidly risen. It is stated that the rent of houses in London and Manchester has advanced quite as much in proportion as the wages of those employed in the building trades. Says Mr. Fawcett: "As there has also been a not less marked rise in the price of coal, meat, milk, butter, cheese, and many other commodities which compose the items of a laborer's ordinary expenditure, it would seem that even in the trades where the advance of wages has been greatest, a large portion of the additional wages has been absorbed by the increased dearness of commodities, and consequently the real remuneration of the laborer may have but very slightly increased."

In respect to that large class whose wages have remained nearly stationary, like clerks, porters, policemen, railway-servants, omnibus-drivers, and others receiving fixed salaries, they are worse off than formerly. Concerning the truth of this there can be no dispute.

The wretched condition of the agricultural laborer is not relieved by a single consideration, save that of emigration. In some counties he fares much better than in others; but in all his case is gloomy enough. Nor do we see much hope for him so long as the present system of land-tenure prevails.

The working-men of Great Britain may derive some comfort in comparing their condition with that of the toiling millions on the continent, but it is a feeling



empty of aspiration. The tendency of the hour is to reduce wages and increase the cost of living. With this closing in of his prospect on both sides, his future is likely to be but little more than a repetition of the past.

How the working classes have been affected by the rise of prices in the United States, has excited considerable discussion. In 1867, Mr. David A. Wells, Special Commissioner of Internal Revenue, stated in his "First Annual Report" that the general rise in the price of labor since 1860 had been about sixty per cent., and the rise in all other commodities ninety per cent. According to this statement, therefore, the working classes were not so well off in 1867 as they were seven years before. The correctness of this conclusion was quite warmly disputed when the "Report" appeared, but, whatever the truth might have been, it is clear enough that wages are much higher now in proportion to other commodities than they were fifteen years ago. And this is so, notwithstanding the fact that, at the present time, business is dull, many are out of employment, and reduction of wages quite general. The prices of commodities are declining more rapidly in proportion, so the laborer is better off in respect to compensation than ever before.

The table contained in the appendix, extracted from the "Fifth Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor," shows conclusively that while the average per cent. of increase in groceries and provisions between the years 1861 and 1873 was 43 per cent., on men's board 66.7 per cent., and on women's board 50 per cent., the average per cent. of increase in wages

by the hour and week in the Pacific Mills, Lawrence, manufacturing cotton goods, was as follows :

Average per cent. of increase in wages by the hour was					
"	"	"	"	males	" 76.9
"	"	"	"	females	" 63.3
"	"	"	"	by the week	" 84
"	"	"	"	males	" 67.6
"	"	"	"	females	" 54.6
"	"	"	"		" 74.3

And also, in the Washington Mills of the same place, manufacturing woolen goods, the

Average per cent. of increase in wages by the hour was					
"	"	"	"	males	" 76.9
"	"	"	"	females	" 71.7
"	"	"	"	by the week	" 88.7
"	"	"	"	males	" 67.7
"	"	"	"	females	" 62.7
"	"	"	"		" 78.9

Besides, in both mills the hours of labor during the interval were reduced from sixty-six hours to sixty-two and a half per week.

Another example may be selected from Mr. Lorin Blodget's paper, read before the Philadelphia Social Science Association in 1872. During that year one hundred and forty thousand persons had been employed in the city, whose wages exceeded sixty-two million dollars. This sum, excluding the holiday season, was about one and a quarter millions per week. Compare these figures with those of 1860. Then, twenty-seven million dollars were paid for wages, but two-thirds as many workmen being employed as in 1872,—thus showing that wages had more than doubled since the former period. It is true a portion of this advance is lost in the enhanced

cost of living, but not all. Wages, therefore, have very materially risen in Philadelphia.

An advance in other places and industries might be shown, though not in all cases so large. We are not sure, however, that the laboring classes will be able to retain the entire increase. Everywhere is the tendency manifest to reduce wages, and, though not falling back to the point they were in 1860, it is probable considerable reductions will be made.

Notwithstanding the prospective reduction, three facts clearly appear from the inquiry. First, labor is surer of getting employment, and, secondly, of receiving a higher reward in the United States, than elsewhere. The third fact is that while the laboring classes have rarely been the gainers by the rise of wages in most countries, they surely have here.

## IV.

THE PAYMENT OF LABOR.

---

It will be the chief purpose of this chapter to remove a fallacy which often deceives the capitalist in contracting for labor. Before doing so, however, we will briefly consider the theoretical and practical relations subsisting between the two classes.

The contest between capitalist and laborer is a contest between present and accumulated labor. Capital is labor saved, nothing more.\* The contest is between those who have saved their labor or inherited it, and those having less. It is a contest of the laborer with the laborer, after all.

There is a very gradual shading between the capitalist having many millions, and the laborer having nothing except his brains and limbs. One man has a vast fortune, another a hundred thousand dollars, another a quarter of that sum, another his farm, another his brains, one a store of goods, one a set of tools, another a shovel. Thus the gradations from the capitalist to the laborer shade off almost imperceptibly, and it is not easy to classify all persons.

Respecting the true relation between capitalist and

---

\* Technically, labor is exertion demanding something for itself in exchange.—Perry, p. 122.

laborer, there is no division of opinion. They are partners in the same enterprise, they are united by a common purpose; hence, there is no reason whatever for jealousy on the part of workmen toward their employers. Such is the belief of all who have investigated the subject.

It may be very easily shown that the true interests of labor and capital are identical. Without the employment of capital, laborers in many cases could not live. An accumulation of capital is necessary to undertake most of the enterprises of the world. While a machine is being made, a railroad built, a crop raised, capital is required upon which to subsist. Without capital, people would live from hand to mouth, according to the common saying; that is, would return to their original state, and live by fishing, hunting, the fruits of the earth, and the like. It is by saving, accumulating capital, that the world has been able to make such progress—to build factories and railroads, and undertake thousands of enterprises.

The capitalist has the means to accomplish these things, if united with labor. He can do nothing without it. To build a railroad, labor is just as essential as capital. Both are indispensable elements. Were the rich man totally unable to unite his capital with labor, he would become a beggar; were the workman unable to get employment from the capitalist, he would starve. The interests of the two are, therefore, inseparably united; their need of each other is equally great.

Notwithstanding this very palpable truth, anything but harmony exists between the two classes. Not



that antagonism prevails everywhere, for beautiful exceptions are seen in Switzerland, and doubtless may be found in other countries. In a work like this we cannot take account of the exceptional instances; we must consider the relations subsisting between the two classes generally. What are these?

The laborer is determined to get the highest wages for the least work; the employer the most work for the least wages.\* The motives of the two classes are the same. The question of paying or receiving a reasonable compensation is not the one determining the question. How much can I get? how little can I pay? these are the questions asked.

The trade-unions of Great Britain have declared this again and again. In the *Edinburgh Review*,† their object is clearly set forth: “‘The final end’ of the trade-unions is ‘to raise to the highest practical point the rate of wages,’ and it is their maxim that no work should be done heartily; to ‘evade’ work and to ‘loiter’ at work are rules; ‘he who is most skillful in these arts is the greatest benefactor to his order;’ ‘the sluggard, according to the standard of the unions, must be the model workman;’ the unionists have plans for making work that is useless to their employers; they, in some cases, oppose the use of

---

\* Burke has said: “There is an implied contract, much stronger than any instrument or article of agreement, between the laborer in any occupation—that the labor, so far as that labor is concerned, shall be sufficient to pay to the employer a profit on his capital and a compensation for his risk; in a word, that the labor shall produce an advantage equal to the payment.”—*Thoughts and Details on Scarcity*, vol. v. p. 137.

† July, 1868.

machinery, and compel the public to make use of inferior articles—for example, hand-made bricks; the Leeds bricklayers have a rule against one man carrying more at a time than ‘the ridiculously small number of eight bricks;’ walking slowly to work, so as to consume as much as possible of the master’s time, has been acted on as a rule; the trade-unions aim at ‘making as much work as possible,’ by rendering the labor of each less efficient;’ the union is, in some cases, so ‘omnipotent over masters,’ that ‘the industrial machine is turned topsy-turvy;’ in cases of outrage, employers are afraid to prosecute, and a witness who appears in court against a trade-union ‘must be helped to emigrate.’”

Turning to the capitalist, what shall be said of him? Is he less selfish? The capitalist, having an advantage of his workman, rarely fails to use it. It is a hard truth that people are forever trying to get advantage of one another. If all laborers were willing to work for a reasonable or just price, and all capitalists were willing to pay it; if every exchanger were willing to buy and sell according to the same beautiful rule—the world would move on in perfect harmony. Unhappily, this is not the case. Every man seeks to get the most he can for what he sells, and pay as little as possible for what he buys. This is the law of the world. In order to carry out the law, all are forever inventing methods by which they can overreach one another, while the overreached are continually applying counter-protectives.

If a restrictive tariff law is enacted by which a railroad company pays twenty-five per cent. more for its

rails, it makes up the advantage thus accruing to the home manufacturer by raising the price of freights.\* If a man intends to buy anything, he hides his real intentions from the seller if he can. Why? Because he fears the seller will take advantage of the buyer's situation to raise the price. So men hide their real purposes, pretending not to want very badly, although their wants may be great; pretending to be not very desirous of selling, although wishing to sell even at a loss. And thus deceptions are employed; each afraid to tell the honest story of his condition, and trust his fellow, because he knows that, generally, men will take advantage of one another when opportunity occurs. The capitalist is like the rest, and, unfortunately for the laboring class, he has an advantage over them which they find difficult to overcome. He can live if all his capital is not employed in reproduction; their labor will not keep, and, if they are not employed, they perish.

For example, A owns a factory run by a hundred hands. They demand higher wages and refuse to work until they are given. But the owner says, "No; I will stop my mill first." He has property beside, and can live upon that until it is exhausted; perhaps he has enough for his support always. But if the laborer does not work, he will starve. It is clear enough, then, that A holds his help in the hollow of his hand, and can squeeze them as hard as he pleases. This is the fact, and every true observer will say so.

---

\* See, as an illustration, Colonel Grosvenor's admirable article on "The Railroads and the Farms," in the *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. xxxii. p. 591.

Admitting the truth of all the beautiful theorizing about the necessary marriage of labor and capital in order to bring forth fruits for both, capital often has a decided advantage.

The laborer sees this. He says: "The capitalist has a great advantage over me; he can compel me to make a contract by which I am not fairly paid for my services." It is like telling a man to deliver up his money or forfeit his life. The capitalist says: "Work for me for so much, or I will starve you to death."

Such are the actual relations subsisting between the two classes. It is a feeling of antagonism instead of harmony, because each class regards its interest as opposed to that of the other. As the capitalist is most favorably situated, he has more advantages and can generally get the better half of the bargain with the laborer. The latter receives the most sympathy—a very unsatisfactory substitute for additional pay.

In making the contract for labor, we maintain that the laborer ought to be willing to work for a reasonable price, and the employer ought to be willing to pay it; and each ought not to take advantage of the situation of the other. If labor be plenty, the employer ought to pay as much, other things with him remaining the same; if scarce, the employed ought to ask no advance of wages, provided his condition in other respects remains unchanged. In short, people ought not to take advantage of one another as they do.

This law men are violating continually. The capitalist declares that, as he is not bound to employ laborers at all, he has the right of paying them any price that may be agreed upon. In other words, as



he is independent of the workman, he may pay him as little or as much as he pleases. The plea on behalf of the capitalist has been put by Mr. Thornton,\* in the following form: "Capital, being under no previous obligation to enter into arrangement with labor at all, is at liberty to reject any arrangement to which she objects, and is entitled to whatever profit may accrue to her from any arrangement to which labor and herself mutually agree." This plea we believe to be wholly wrong, and if we can succeed in proving this, as well as the truth of our position, labor will stand upon a prouder basis in making contracts than ever before.

What are the relative positions of the two? Let the capitalist cease to employ the laborer, and how much capital has he left? Absolutely nothing. The laborer keeps him from sinking. Dispense with his services, and capital vanishes into thin air. Dispense with labor, and every vessel will rot at the wharves, every farm will run to weeds, the spindle will not give out its music. No man will have anything except what he can get by direct exertion. As for selling his property and living upon the income, who will buy if no labor can be employed? A great factory would not sell for a dollar, because it would be of no more use to the purchaser than the moon. That all desire to preserve their property and enhance its value, is a general truth which no one will deny. Of course, there are spendthrifts who have no ability or desire to acquire property, or to keep what they may have

---

\* "On Labor," p. 138.



inherited. But this is not true of mankind in general. Their desire is for more wealth, to save what they have, and add to its value. These two facts being true,—that all are intent upon saving their property, and that labor is absolutely necessary for this purpose,—the property-owner ought to be willing to pay a fair compensation for the labor whereby his riches are saved and increased.

The usual way of looking at the question is this: no man need build a ship or a factory in order to employ labor, because he can loan his money and live upon the income received. But what do others want of his money if they cannot employ labor with it? If the manufacturer gets tired of his business and resolves to quit, upon the ground that he is under no obligation to employ any one, he sells his establishment; and what then? Why, he invests his property in other concerns which employ labor. He employs and pays for labor less directly; that is the only difference. His money is put to the same use as before. He buys railroad stocks; but the railroad employs labor in great quantities. He puts it in a bank; but the bank employs labor, and loans its capital to others who use it to pay for labor. Everywhere capital and labor touch, and if they do not, one is as worthless as the other. Whether employed directly, or loaned to others for them to use, capital must be employed in union with labor, else it is absolutely valueless. The man who is worth a million is as poor as the man not having a dollar, and both must get a living by simple and similar tasks. As men will not do that,—as they will use their capital themselves, or loan it to others

to be used by them,—they are bound to pay a reasonable reward to the laborer for his services.

Again, the capitalist asks: "Have I not a right to do what I will with mine own? If I throw my capital away, surely I am under no obligation to employ workmen; for if I am, then all are bound to employ labor, whether having capital or not." If a man has nothing, he cannot be required to employ labor; if he has property he is bound to use it, either directly or indirectly, for his own and others' support. Discussion has long been rife respecting the right of private property, and not a few hold that no sound reason can be given for claiming absolute personal ownership of things. We do not share in this view; but that private property is both justifiable and necessary rests upon the economic principle: it is the most effective form for administering the external resources in the production of national wealth, and the most effective form of providing for the necessary wants of individuals.\* Hence, the owner of property must use it in reproducing wealth, or must spend it in other ways, for this is a duty he owes to society. Government, in protecting property, thus enabling its owner to accumulate more, puts him under obligation to employ a portion of it in reproduction, as well as to expend another portion in the maintenance of himself. He has no right to throw it away. He must use his property himself in some way or other; for, if he will not, nor loan it, his property becomes worthless, and the state must aid him. The state has power to prevent men

---

\* See "*Kaufmann's Socialism*," p. 45.

from wasting their substance and becoming a burden to the public.

The argument may be easily pressed further. The preservation of property is necessary for the perpetuity of the state and the discharge of its obligations. To permit a person to destroy his property—for this is the effect of not using it in reproduction or exchange—is to bankrupt the state, stop every public improvement, and do away altogether with the governing power. What would become of the heavy debts of all the principal nations of the earth if private property were destroyed? And how could even those who are called to govern be paid? Thus it is perfectly clear that the preservation of private property is necessary for the perpetuity of the state itself. But property is preserved only through use, either in reproduction or exchange. The owner of capital who refuses to employ it in connection with labor, or to exchange it for other commodities, is no better off than the man without capital. He is a pauper, but for what he can earn by his own exertions. What, then, can be clearer than this: if persons possessing property did not employ it in any way whatever, the state would have the right to make some use of it? Perhaps the right of the state to take so much as may be needed for its own maintenance, in the way of taxes, will be admitted. Here, however, the objector stops and says: "Surely the state has no right to take any more, or exercise any further control." Agreeing to this, should individuals not make use of their property, then the state, though taking all they had, would not get enough, for unemployed capital has no value. So

the practical conclusion is, if people maintained the right to do what they pleased with their property and chose to do nothing with it, the state, for the purpose of self-protection, would be compelled to take it all and employ it whenever feasible. It cannot be true, then, that the owner of property has an absolute right to do with it according to his own pleasure. His tenure of anything is conditioned upon his employment of it in reproduction or exchange. We admit he has the choice of letting the state have his property ; but who will allow only the smallest portion to be taken in this way? Every man desires to retain his own, and we have seen the condition upon which this can be done. Destruction is not permissible ; use must be made of property, or the state is compelled to take it to maintain itself.

Now, in order to use it, as we have seen, capital must be harnessed into the car with the working-man. Capital is utterly worthless unless joined with labor. Men are in fact bound to employ labor, or else their possessions, whether great or small, are of no value to them or to any one else. Labor is just as necessary a factor in the saving and reproduction of capital, as in producing capital in the first place. Let no one forget that in this discussion we are not talking of anything but labor, present and accumulated. Accumulated labor, to be worth anything, must be united with present labor ; the two operate together. Consequently, the assertion is without foundation that the capitalist is under no obligation to employ labor. Such an obligation does exist. He has no right to throw his property away. We assume that every man is



desirous of saving his property ; if so, he must employ labor, else his property becomes valueless. And if he must employ labor to save it, he ought to pay a fair compensation therefor. Suppose a man's house was in danger of being carried away by a flood, and some men coming along were asked to help in saving it. They have no time to make a definite bargain as to the remuneration, but engage with a hearty will, and by their efforts save the house. Would not every one say the owner of that house was mean if he were not willing to pay those men a reasonable compensation for their services? The position of the capitalist is the same in respect to his property. His capital will vanish like a stroke of lightning unless united with labor. Analyze the uses made of capital, and all cannot help admitting the fact.

From this line of reasoning, it appears clear to us that capital is not only under obligation to employ labor, but to pay a reasonable price for it. To some the argument may seem prolix or even unnecessary, but there are many who will not accede to our view. If it be sound, the laborer is placed upon a juster and more commanding plane in contracting with the capitalist. It is most important to intrench himself in this position, if possible ; for, should he succeed, the way is easy for obtaining exact justice from his employer.

As between workmen, there is a natural difference ; one man is worth more than another, because he has greater strength or skill. It is right that the strongest and most skillful should receive higher wages. Concerning these natural advantages, there is nothing to



be said. What we object to is the use of artificial and wrongful advantage. If the corn crop is less this year, the price should not be increased, except to require people to practice economy, or for some other good reason. If laborers are plentiful, let them be paid as much; if they are scarce, let them work for the old prices. Let no advantage be taken of unnatural, artificial, or forced conditions, and all will be well.

It will be said that this mode of reasoning is contrary to the operation of supply and demand. Shall that law cease to be applied? No, not in the true sense. All that we have written about asking and expecting reasonable prices does not conflict with the working of this law. There is, however, a wide difference between the natural and unnatural operation of supply and demand. Rightly interpreted, the law is this—demand is what people really need and would purchase if they could buy at a reasonable price; and supply is the quantity that can be had at such a price. But the world is forever interfering with this law, by creating artificial scarcity on the one hand, and, on the other, by trying to make the demand less than it really is, so as to beat down the price. The law, to a great extent, does not express the truth about exchanges. The real demand is often much greater than purchases indicate, and the supply also. But people deceive one another; they exercise force, they refuse to sell when they really want to, hoping for an advance of prices. The buyer refuses to buy, although he really wants the thing, hoping to get a reduction of price. So numerous are the deceptions practiced,

the real state of things is covered up so deeply, that the natural law of demand and supply has, in fact, only a limited operation.

How often does a transaction like the following occur. It was found last April that there were twenty thousand bales of cotton in New York, and thirty thousand in Liverpool, less than were supposed to be in those markets. Besides, the quantity received at Bombay, India, was not so large by forty thousand bales as during the corresponding week of the previous year. If the law of demand and supply had had anything to do with the commodity, its price would have risen in consequence of this great diminution; but what did happen? As soon as the fact was known that the supply was not so great as supposed by nearly one hundred thousand bales, cotton speculators in New York sold forty-eight thousand bales to be delivered on a future day. The effect of these heavy sales was to depress the market. The *Liverpool Daily Post*, in commenting upon the transaction, remarked that it certainly did appear absurd with a diminution in the supply of nearly one hundred thousand bales of cotton in one week, there should be found men of sufficient temerity to sell forty-eight thousand bales on a single day for future delivery. But these sales had the effect intended, namely, to prevent a rise in the price of cotton, which is precisely the event that would have happened had the law of demand and supply operated. From the 1st of September, 1874, to the 9th of April following, four million seven hundred and ten thousand bales were sold in New York to be delivered at a future time, while

the entire amount of cotton received during that period was only three hundred thousand bales. These facts being true, who can doubt that the price of cotton is regulated by artificial means, and not by the law of supply and demand? Such certainly is the belief of those who buy the article for purposes of manufacture.

What is a reasonable price depends upon many things. Obviously, it is impossible to draw any hard and fast line defining it. The most we can do is to find out what principle should govern in making contracts between capitalist and workman. This is a reasonable price without regard to any advantage which either capitalist or laborer might take of the condition of the other.

Some considerations, however, may be mentioned in making contracts for labor. First, laborers should receive the highest wages when profits are largest. To some of our readers this may seem a very trite observation, but for centuries no such principle was acknowledged by employers. They paid fixed prices, the lowest possible, and never raised them because profits increased. The acknowledgment of this principle marks a step forward in adjusting the relations between capital and labor. In basing remuneration upon profits, solid ground is occupied, and naught remains save to ascertain what proportions capital and labor shall receive.

It is true, though, that a question was long ago raised concerning the extent of the fund out of which labor is paid, but, for our own part, we fail to see anything so mysterious or deep about the matter. However simple a subject may be, one can generally

succeed in getting puzzled over it if he tries hard ; but if one is seeking to know what the fund is from which the working-man gets his dues, the answer is easy enough. The wages fund is the sum accruing from the sale of goods after all the expenses of production except labor are paid. Says Judge Kettle: "After making certain payments, such as replacement of material, maintenance of plant, ordinary interest upon capital, premium to cover risk, and that disputable item, cost of management, the balance of price then in the hands of the master is what should be divided between the wages fund and the profit fund." The dispute between masters and men is, what portion of the price received for the joint product of labor and capital shall go to the laborer. There is a complete unity of interest between the two classes throughout the whole course of production and exchange that as much as possible shall be produced and exchanged for the highest price. Immediately upon the sale of the product their interests diverge, each class being desirous of retaining the largest portion of the price possible. To determine this question, the foregoing rule of paying the laborer a reasonable reward for his labor might be successfully applied.

Secondly, the laborer should receive more where the work is hazardous to life and health than in those occupations which are healthy and free from accident. An operative in a powder-mill, or who makes certain parts of a brimstone match, ought to receive higher wages than a person working in a woolen-factory, which is comparatively healthy and safe.

Thirdly, a person ought not to expect so much who



receives regular employment as a person who cannot get work regularly. The ordinary hackman is justified in charging more for conveying passengers, if he can get them only now and then, than if he were employed all the time. The same person will charge less by the hour if employed for several hours, than to go a short distance, in proportion to the time required. This is just. A great many who work in factories, especially in New England, ought not to expect so much, because their employers, in most instances, feel bound to give them constant employment if possible. Ofttimes they run, and at a loss, when they would not, except to keep their help employed. Other considerations of less importance probably enter into the contract fixing the price of wages.

There are some subsidiary questions surrounding the main one which require notice. It is said that labor is paid enough generally, whatever the price may be, because, as a class, workmen do not make a wise use of their wages.

That workmen are often prodigal in the use of their wages will not be denied. In the previous chapter we have seen how wages have advanced in some countries, especially in the United States. Here, laborers have reaped the richest harvest. Only few of them have saved the increase. Some of them have, but the larger number spend all they earn. The goods in factory stores have greatly changed, which is the best proof of the extravagance of the class. The quantity of jewelry they wear, their finer clothing, the amusements patronized, and food consumed,—these things are proof, not only of higher wages, but of what is done



with them. In England the industrial classes work fewer days in the week and spend a larger portion of their earnings in the ale-houses, so that neither they nor their families are better off by their increased gains. They live upon a lower plane than the workman in the United States, who spends his additional income in dress, amusements, jewelry, and the like.

Now, it is said, why pay them so much? they do not make an economic use of their money; teach them to use it properly before giving it to them. This, by way of advice, is good. Operatives spend a great deal of money foolishly, and they should be taught to save it against a day of want, and for nobler uses. Yet, is this a good defense against paying them higher wages?

The same mode of arguing will cut the manufacturer off from making money, for does he put it to any better use than his operatives? Is he not as extravagant? does he not spend as much money foolishly? He cannot, in truth, say anything on that score.

Thus, we have gone over the ground between the capitalist and laborer, and sought to find out how the latter should be paid. No rule fixing the price of labor has preference over a division of the profits upon some agreed plan whenever a division is practicable. But it is not practicable to base remuneration directly upon profits in every case; and when it is not, the rule sought to be established in this chapter is just and easy of application.

## V.

THE GOOD AND EVIL OF TRADE-UNIONS.

---

No one will deny the vast importance to which trade-unions have attained, for the influence they wield over their members is enormous; and a marvel, too, because obedience is so general while being purely voluntary. It is true the members in submitting freely to organized rule believe they are really promoting their own personal advantage, yet this does not always appear, and when the interest is unseen, or thought to be opposed to the interest of the individual, his temptation to disobey is great. Such discipline, therefore, as trade-unions often exhibit must excite admiration, however bitterly they may be condemned.

Trade-unions have their origin in the rise of factories. So long as workmen were isolated in their tasks and could not meet together in large numbers, no organization existed among them, and the dominion of the employer over his men was complete. But times have changed. Great factories have arisen employing thousands. When they daily assemble under the same roof, tend the same machine, and work at the same table, is it not natural, nay reasonable, to confer and act together upon questions in which all are mutually interested? Besides, manufac-

turing cities have sprung up, busily engaged in producing the same commodities, thus augmenting the mutual personal interest. Sheffield, Manchester, Lyons, Verviers, Lowell, Pittsburg, are names of great cities, in each of which nearly all the capital and skill are united in a single industry.

Railways and other facilities of easy communication also lend their aid in forming these unions, by bringing workmen together and enabling them to render fraternal assistance. A recent writer upon the condition of the operatives in the factories of Wurtemberg remarks that if its scattered industry has been a source of much inconvenience and some pecuniary detriment to the manufacturers, combinations among workmen have been rendered difficult, if not impossible. "The operatives of isolated spinning-factories scattered along the banks of woodland streams or connected together in smaller numbers in the neighborhood of rural towns, or weavers who worked dispersed in their own domiciles, and only came into casual contact with one another on their way to and from their common employer,—these men had little occasion for or incentive to hostile combination." But this state of things has passed away in that country as in almost every other, by creating the railway and the manufacturing city.

While stating this as the immediate or superficial origin of trade-unions, the deeper one, as we have shown in a previous chapter, is the discontent existing between workmen and their employers respecting the division of profits. In the language of Mr. Hewitt, an iron-manufacturer, whose testimony before the Trade-Unions Commission of Great Britain evinced

wide observation coupled with the deepest insight into the subject: "Trade-unions are a symptom of the readjustment of the relation of capital and labor."

Trade-unions are increasing in number and influence. In Great Britain, the United States, Belgium, and most of the European countries where their formation is not prohibited by law, the ranks of unionists are constantly swelling with fresh accessions. In every trade of much importance a portion of the workmen have organized these societies. What the total numbers are, we have no means of ascertaining. One estimate has put the number of unionists in Great Britain at eight hundred and sixty thousand; but this, probably, is too small. The membership in the United States has never been determined by any official or other authority.

Nor can it be said these unions contain only workmen of inferior skill and intelligence. The proportion between the skilled and unskilled varies, doubtless, in different trades and at different times. "It is probable that in many trades some of the best and most educated men stand aloof. It has not, however, been suggested by any one that the union is ever composed of the inferior order of workmen, though it may not invariably be composed of the superior. In some trades—and those requiring the greatest skill—it seems to be admitted that the union contains the great bulk of the most skilled men, as the engineers, the iron-founders, the painters, glass-makers, printers, ship-builders, and others."\*

---

\* Messrs. Hughes and Harrison, Dissenting Report, p. 33.

Respecting the right to form these associations, it is just as evident that laborers have the right to combine in order to get their dues as masters have to resist an advance of wages. As long ago as when Adam Smith wrote, he said that "masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform, combination not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbors and equals."

Employers, in many cases, are combined by stronger ties than a tacit understanding. In Great Britain and elsewhere associations have been formed by masters, the principal object of which is to control the rate of wages. Say Messrs. Hughes and Harrison: "It is plain to us that the rules of these associations are entirely similar to the rules of the unions, and quite as coercive as any of them."

The object of workmen in combining is to form a reserve fund, by means of which they seek to put themselves upon an equal plane with the capitalist in bargaining for wages. The latter, having such a fund, occupies a vantage-ground in respect to the workman, for the capitalist is a combination himself. Workmen, in combining, only seek to get what capitalists already possess,—namely, a reserve force, so that they can bargain for their labor upon favorable terms. It seems impossible to frame an argument for preventing the sons of toil from doing this, unless the old-fashioned and exploded idea be maintained that workmen are bondmen to the capitalists, who, conse-



quently, have the sole right to determine the rewards of labor. In France, where the notion still lingers, we hear now and then of efforts to regulate the price of labor by law, but in no other country. Freedom to labor is as universally recognized as any other right. All have their choice to work separately, or unite and form a partnership or other organization, if they like.

It was a long period before workmen in England were permitted to form these societies, so strongly intrenched were capitalists in the legislation of the realm. In 1799, the following act of Parliament showed the willingness of that body to legislate against the combination of workmen: "Contracts entered into for obtaining an advance of wages, for altering the usual time for working, or for decreasing the quantity of work (excepting such contract be made between a master and his journeyman), or preventing any person employing whomsoever they may think proper in their trade, or for controlling the conduct, or any way affecting any person or persons carrying on any manufacture or business, in the conduct or management thereof, shall be declared illegal, null, and void."

This statute illustrates how workmen were regarded in that day. Not until 1827 did Parliament repeal all statutes prohibiting workmen from combining. Until then employers and Parliament had taken it for granted that they alone could regulate wages.

In France the law permitting workmen to combine was not decreed until 1864. Prior to that period the "Penal Code" contained the most rigorous stipulations against combinations of workmen. They were char-

acterized as misdemeanors, and the promoters of them were punished with from two to five years' imprisonment. It is fair to state that the combination of employers for the purpose of unjustly depressing wages was also declared to be illegal, though the punishment inflicted was less severe.

In the several states constituting the German empire various laws were in force relating to the rights of workmen until 1867, when a new enactment went into operation throughout the empire, declaring that "all prohibitions and penal provisions directed against persons engaged in industry, trade, assistants, journeymen, or factory operatives, on the ground of their co-operating and uniting for the purpose of obtaining more favorable wages and conditions of labor, more especially by means of strikes or discharge of workmen, are repealed," thus guaranteeing to the industrial classes the right to form trade-union associations.

In the United States workmen have no just reason to complain, for they have always stood upon the same footing with capitalists, and have enjoyed the unquestioned right to form trade-union societies. Not until very recently has the old doctrine been revived that the state has a right to control the price of labor. Governor Brown, of Georgia, in an annual message to the Legislature of that State, did remark that "labor must be controlled by law." There is no occasion for fearing the re-establishment of this doctrine on republican soil. Liberty to contract for labor is a right too deeply grounded to be crushed out by the fiat of Governor Brown, or by any one else holding a similar opinion.

All this by way of clearing the field for inquiring into the purpose of trade-unions and the soundness of their methods.

Their purpose is twofold: first, that of an ordinary friendly or benefit society,—namely, to afford relief to the members of the union when incapacitated from work by accident or sickness; to provide a sum for the funeral expenses of members and their wives; and sometimes to grant superannuation allowances to members disabled by old age. Second, that of a trade society,—namely, to watch over and promote the interests of the working classes in the several trades, and especially to protect them against the undue advantage which the command of a large capital is supposed to give the employers of labor.

Many societies exist having only one object in view. Some are purely friendly societies; others are organizations for promoting the interests of members in their various trades without any reference to their social welfare. For years in all the countries of Europe societies of the former description have flourished, while trade-unions are of recent creation. Thus we have seen that workmen in France were not permitted to combine in order to raise the rate of wages until 1867; but they have helped each other in an organized way during sickness and old age, and provided for burial, and done other humane acts for a long period. And this applies as truly to many other countries as to France.

It has been found desirable generally to unite the two purposes, and in this form most trade-unions exist. Considerable opposition to them as thus con-

stituted has been manifested, because persons who are friendly to purely benefit organizations and hostile to those organized for purposes of trade oppose societies combining this double purpose. No enemies to friendly societies have appeared, for their purpose is a most noble one, and the good they have done is incalculable. The amount yearly distributed to sick members and expended for burial, and other like purposes, is an eloquent testimony to the character of these institutions. But in uniting the two objects trade-unions taint the sensibilities of some people, who are moved on this account to compass their destruction.

Much can be advanced in favor of, and against, this coupling of ends. Did they remain separate, friendly societies would have the aid of all, for their usefulness none will dispute. Besides, they would grow in numbers and in income. Thousands who would not join trade-unions aiming to affect the price of wages only, would gladly join societies of a friendly nature. A great many workmen beyond the pale of unionism are likely to remain outside, who are desirous of joining their fellow-workers in alleviating distress, and, consequently, lay the foundation for being aided in return. Moreover, benevolent men live everywhere who would willingly join friendly organizations, and contribute moral and financial support.

On the other hand, trade-unions are dignified and ennobled by superadding a friendly and humane purpose to that of a trade society. Though they inflict much evil, the enmity against them is somewhat softened when the good they do is remembered. But we cannot agree with Mr. Morrier that the strength of



the English system depends upon the two-edged purpose to which the funds of trade-unions may be applied. Doubtless they are stronger when created in this manner, but their vitality depends upon something more substantial than this.

So far as the members are concerned, this question is of little importance. Provided they know what they are giving their money for, whether sickness, burial, strikes, or anything else, it is their business, and theirs alone. And they probably do know, both by personal inquiry and by experience, how unions can employ their funds. Mr. Morrier is hardly fair in saying they are raised for purposes of peace, but are applicable to the purposes of war. It is known before they are given for what purposes they may be used. No deception is necessary, nor is it practiced, in raising funds for these societies.

Whenever a society unites both purposes, it is evident that a separation of funds for any particular object is quite impracticable. The cry is heard every now and then that a division of the resources for friendly and trade objects ought to be made. It comes from some one who either does not understand the nature of the organization, or is so keen as to see that, by providing several funds, collision would probably arise among the members, ending perhaps in disunion. This will appear clearly when the nature of the organization is more fully explained.

Its income is derived from members who pay a certain sum weekly, monthly, or annually, according to its rules. This sum, as remarked, is devoted to several purposes. One purpose is to provide some-



thing for sick members during their illness. Another is termed an accident benefit, which consists of a sum given to those who lose their tools; while a third is a burial fund. Besides these, some of the richer unions have additional funds for reading-rooms, libraries, donations, and charitable subscriptions.

The benefits conferred often extend much further. One of the most frequent and costly objects of donation is to members out of work. This is occasionally so large as to maintain all the workmen of a trade during a period of disaster. During the year 1867 the engineers of Great Britain spent two hundred and ninety-one thousand two hundred and fifteen dollars in this manner; and the iron-founders nearly two-thirds of that sum. The great service thus rendered in keeping a large number of working-men and their families from the cold field of pauperism no one will question.

We proceed now to consider the main purpose of trade-union societies. Whenever the two purposes are found united in the same organization, the chief purpose always is to raise directly and indirectly the price of labor. This, no unionist will deny.

To begin with the indirect methods first. One method of raising wages is to prevent competition among workmen. The quantity of work being limited, and a superabundance of labor in most countries existing, competition among laborers is the natural consequence of this state of things. Wherever competition exists, employers pay much lower wages; in truth, workmen themselves cut under one another until they receive barely enough to keep them from

starving. This is the only limit to cheapness of wages. Men will not starve so long as they can get work, and, the supply being short, for centuries they have toiled at ruinous rates. Thus workmen, by reason of their excessive numbers, are the authors of their own misfortunes. While they can justly complain of their employers, in many cases, for not paying more, on the other hand the latter can say with truth they have paid the price demanded. In short, the supply being excessive, the capitalist has paid only the smallest rates, and knew perfectly well there was no need of paying more. It was evident enough that, could competition be prevented, wages would rise. If there be work for only two men, and four offer to do it, the price will be very small; but let the four agree that only two shall apply, and the others keep away, perhaps the rate of wages will be doubled. What more rational plan, then, could workmen devise for raising wages than to prevent, so far as possible, competition? in other words, to reduce the supply of labor.

So long as proper rules for preventing competition are observed, we see no ground for condemning this object of trade-unions. For it is a thing of common occurrence to create scarcity in the market and so enhance price. Mr. Mill relates an instance in point in his "*Principles of Political Economy*." He says the owners of the Spice Islands for a long period enjoyed a monopoly of the trade, and, in order to keep the price of the article up, in good seasons destroyed a portion of the crop. Constantly do we hear of practices being resorted to for the purpose of

increasing scarcity and enhancing price. We do not contend that any person, whether laborer, merchant, or manufacturer, has a right to ask more than a reasonable price for whatever he desires to part with, but, to obtain that price, we can see no injustice in preventing competition among laborers, provided the methods of securing this end do not infringe upon the liberties of any one.

What, then, are trade-unions doing to prevent competition? By one rule they limit absolutely the number of hours each person shall work. The object of this rule is clearly enough seen,—to divide work among a larger number. Additional reasons, worthy of consideration, are given for fixing a limit to working hours.

One reason is that it prevents the laborer from overtasking his energies, as he is often tempted to do, in order to increase his earnings. Not infrequently have workmen impaired their health by prolonged exertion. Thousands of persons by unduly taxing their powers have died, leaving helpless families to face the icy charities of the world. So far, therefore, as shortening the hours of labor is required by the laws of health, who will not commend the action of these societies? Sentiments of humanity demand that the laborer be not overtaxed; and if trade-unions did nothing worse than prevent this, no indictment could be found against them.

Another object in preventing overwork is to make employment for more persons. Be it said to the credit of these associations, their efforts to provide work for all, or rather to divide so far as practicable

what work there is among all, is a pure and praiseworthy motive. Such conduct testifies to their regard for one another. The most skilled of the working classes are able to obtain work always; how generous is their conduct, therefore, in consenting to work fewer hours, so that those possessing less skill can have an opportunity to earn a livelihood! All efforts of this sort peaceably put forth are laden with the best results; who can condemn them?

A third reason for working shorter hours is that time is saved for self-improvement. When honestly expressed, this reason merits consideration. But it has a suspicious look, and by many it is regarded as a cover for getting higher wages. Those who are attempting to deceive the public in this way will not only fail, but lose its sympathy and support. The claims of workmen, no matter what they are, ought to be honestly expressed, so as to create a universal belief in the purity of their motives.

It is quite true employers may suffer inconvenience and loss in some cases from the refusal of their help to work only a certain number of hours, but we apprehend that many violations of these rules must arise in those places where it is most desirable for workmen to do more than their accustomed tasks. For, evidently, the foregoing rule is meant to apply chiefly to those cases where the supply of work is limited; in places where this does not happen, the cause of the workman suffers nothing in getting all the employment he can. This rule is designed for those localities in which an excess of laborers live wanting employment, and if, in such cases, persons



having regular work choose to cut down the number of working hours voluntarily, in order to give the less fortunate son of toil an opportunity to earn something, very rarely can any detriment accrue to the employer.

We now come to a rule enforced by many trade-unions of a very different character: prohibiting the employment of apprentices, or limiting their number. It is true this rule is not maintained by all trade-unions; many exceptions might be noted. Thus, in the evidence adduced before the Trade-Unions Commission, it was found to be an open question with the carpenters, masons, bricklayers, joiners, iron-makers, shipwrights, and printers as to whether, and if so, how many, apprentices should be employed in any shop or trade. Nevertheless, the right to limit the supply of labor in a given trade so as to raise the rate of wages, is a claim distinctly made by some unionists. Mr. Wilkinson, the Secretary of the National Flint-Glass Makers' Friendly Society, says: "The limitation of apprentices is simply because we consider that as working-men who have been brought up in the trade, and have devoted years to learn it, . . . we have a right in a certain measure to limit the supply in accordance with what the demand may be." Mr. Alexander Campbell, a champion of trade-unions, puts the claim in a little more plausible way. Putting his words into the mouth of a workman, he says: "We further object to employers taking more apprentices than we have determined to be consistent to the keeping of a regular supply of hands in the trade, because an unlimited number of apprentices throws



more men into our trade or profession than can find regular employment, and thus causes our union to be heavily taxed for their support, or otherwise compels them to tramp from place to place, begging leave to toil, to the evident injury of the trade and their own degradation; and another reason we have against an undue number of apprentices is that you have no right to ask us to communicate our skill to your apprentices, as the result will be to permanently supersede us in our employment, as in most trades young men are preferred to those above fifty years of age." Mr. Shreeve, Secretary of the Printing-Machine Managers Trade Society, says, in alluding to his association: "The way in which we look at this apprentice question is simply this: that we have served our time to a business, and work to get a respectable living by it. We know that if there are four men to do two men's work the wages must come down." Such are the reasons advanced for limiting the number of apprentices in each particular trade.

In reply to the foregoing, we hold the limitation to be unjust to the class either practically or wholly shut out; and further, a logical deduction from this principle of exclusion is, that persons pursuing any particular business have a right to prevent others from engaging therein. Consider the case of the glass-makers already mentioned. Were the claim true that they had a right to say how many workmen should engage in their employment, the owners of that concern or any other glass-manufactory might declare with equal propriety to any new enterprise: "You have no right to go on with your undertaking. We

have been engaged in this business for a long period, we have put our money and skill into it, our profits are not excessively large, and there is really no opening for you; and if you persist in undertaking this business our profits will be reduced, and perhaps some of us will be ruined. In that case, all the men in our employ will be thrown out of work." To this it will be replied: "You are stretching the argument." Not in the least. The fact is, in some cases, workmen have made an effort to limit production so as to keep up the price of labor. Of colliers especially is this true. It is the natural outcome of such a principle. To shut out a part of the race needing employment because of their age or inexperience, upon the ground that the supply of work belongs to those engaged in it, is monstrous, and naturally leads to opposing the extension of trade, whereby profits are likely to be reduced, and consequently wages. Those workmen, therefore, are logical who, regarding the supply of labor in any given trade as belonging to them, oppose the extension of their business, whereby products are cheapened and wages diminished.

Now, if there be any ground upon which trade-unions can stand, and we do not deny this, it must be in taking the condition of the entire working class into account. To declare these associations to be for the benefit of the working population, when they are only for the benefit of a class, is a cheat. They are not unions at all. They are merely class societies instituted for the benefit of a particular class of workmen. We have stated the only argument ever advanced in support of the rule limiting the number of

apprentices who may be employed in a particular trade. Those engaged in it have no more right to control the supply of labor than producers have to limit production, except in special cases provided by law. Were this not so, a person might build a great factory, and fill it with costly machinery, and produce nothing, unless, forsooth, permission be given by workmen to the owner to employ help for running the concern. Thus we see that the argument respecting the employment of apprentices is bound up with the question concerning the limit to production. If workmen have no right to limit the number of factories, they have no right to limit the quality and quantity of the help who may be employed in them.

Were it maintained that older workmen receive less pay in consequence, and so are directly affected by the introduction of apprentices, this claim would be quite another thing and furnish some ground for interposing. To state the claim in a different manner—if, on account of the poorer skill displayed by these less experienced hands, the pay of the rest is reduced, they might complain of unfair treatment. But is this ever the case? If an apprentice is hired to do a certain piece of work which is completed in quite as satisfactory manner as it could be done by a skilled workman, how can the latter suffer? And, in fact, the employment of so many of them is directly contrary to the theory that they are incapable of doing the work they undertake. The only way workmen can be injured by apprentices is by increasing the supply of labor. And this is the real effect which workmen seek to obviate. But then, all workmen are equally

entitled to a living, and no one has a right to say that another shall remain idle. This is directly contrary to the object of creating trade-union societies. The state, indeed, may claim a paramount right over apprentices for purposes of education or public defense, but so far as the working classes are concerned, no one has a right to control the work of another; in other words, no one has a better right to monopolize work than a manufacturer has to monopolize the production of a particular thing.

Mr. Campbell introduced a more plausible argument, which was the chief reason for quoting from his paper. It was that employers had no right to ask workmen to communicate their skill to apprentices by stealth. If they are employed with the idea they can go into the workshop, mingle with experienced workmen, and by watching and inquiry learn a particular trade, compensation should be made for the information thus given. It has cost the older workmen time and money to learn their trade, it is capital to them, and mean indeed would be the employer to put inferior workers with the most skilled, believing that the latter would aid the former either directly or indirectly without compensation. We imagine, however, this is not often the case; but when it does occur, surely those skilled ought to receive a recompense for all the instruction they impart.

Messrs. Hughes and Harrison, in their "Dissenting Report," find a sort of justification for limiting the number of apprentices in the fact that the leading professions prescribe terms of admission. We cannot discover the slightest analogy between the conduct of



trade-unions and that of other associations or professions. The question with the workman is not whether the apprentice is qualified for his work, but whether he shall become qualified.

If the members of the legal fraternity, for example, should conclude there were lawyers enough,—and who can doubt it?—and forbade any increase, then an analogy would exist. But this is not the case. Every one, of his own choice, can study for admission, and, provided he fulfills the prescribed conditions, can enter, no matter how many may have passed before him. But the flint-glass makers say: “No; you shall not learn the trade any way, whether there be work enough for you or not.” This is purely arbitrary, unjust, and utterly at war with the principle upon which trade-unions are founded,—that of providing work for the largest number possible.

What we have said concerning the treatment of apprentices applies with quite as much force to non-unionists. Why shut them out from employment? Were unionists more competent and feared the mingling of non-unionists might reduce wages, their admission might be opposed with reason. But this reason is never given, and cannot be, because non-unionists are not less competent workmen. The only object in shutting them out is to force them into the union societies. To cut off a man's daily bread in order to necessitate his seeking admission into a society is a serious, as well as a severe, proceeding, for which there is no justification. Unions, to win the respect of the public, must exercise greater freedom, and not resort to such harsh measures for attaining their ends. What



justice in claiming for unionists a monopoly of all work? Who gave them this paramount claim to it? If such a claim be unfounded, and all laborers stand upon the same plane, those not belonging to unions are just as much entitled to work as unionists. All working-men are equally free to join or remain as they are; because some are unionists and more are not is no reason for drawing a line between them and claiming all the work for one particular portion.

The same rule has been widened so as to exclude women from employment. In many cases women ought not to go into the workshop. Especially is this true of married women. The husband alone should work; and if this practice were general in countries having a superabundance of labor the supply would be considerably lessened, and the wages accruing to a family quite as large as though both were employed. Generally, therefore, it would be for the interest of labor in the case of married persons, did not the wife engage in the same occupation as her husband and busied herself in looking more carefully after the family. This is so generally admitted that no more need be said for the dullest to understand it. Trade-unions, to this extent, are acting wisely in attempting to diminish the supply of labor.

To this rule one exception must be noted. Women unmarried, or having husbands who are unable to work, should have the privilege of earning a living when they are able. Consider the condition of a large family. The husband has become unable to work. The family are dependent upon him for bread. They have no resource unless the mother can take the hus-

band's place. The loudest cry of humanity is heard to give her employment. Shall the family starve when the mother is able and anxious to work? The same reasons apply to unmarried women. They must live, for life is as dear to them as to any other class. To live, they must work; why cut them off? They do not, like the married portion of their sex, have any one to aid them. They must earn a living themselves, or starve. These are the only alternatives. There is no reason for denying work to this class, and, in attempting to do so, trade-unions adopt a cruel and unjustifiable policy.

In regard to the extent of this practice, Messrs. Hughes and Harrison admit: "There can be little doubt that it is constantly enforced whenever the union is strong enough to insist on it." They also affirm that the practice is unsocial, and often carried out in a vexatious and arbitrary spirit; but they add, in the way of smoothing down its harshness, that it is too common among other classes of the community to receive any special treatment. It is common to corporations, confraternities, and parties of all kinds. This we admit is partially true, though rarely is it carried so far. Occasionally we hear of persons underselling in trade for the purpose of ruining some one, but these instances are infrequent. Whether they are common or not, neither merchants, workmen, nor any other class have a right to ruin persons by the use of such means.

To be as strongly condemned is the effort to monopolize the work within a given district. This has been attempted in some cases. For example, a so-

ciety of brickmakers in England "claim an extent of four miles round Manchester in every direction—an area of one hundred and twenty square miles—as their peculiar district, within the limits of which they permit no bricks to be made except by Manchester union men, nor any bricks to be used except those made within the district." They accomplish the latter object through an alliance with the Manchester Bricklayers' Union, the members of which will not set any bricks not made within the above-named district. How they have acquired this exclusive right to the work within that locality the public have never been informed. The deed conferring the right has never been shown.

Another expedient of trade-unions for repressing competition is fixing a *minimum* rate of wages, and prohibiting their members from working by the piece. Unions have a perfect right to prescribe such a rule if they like. Both classes suffer from its application—the better workmen at all times in not receiving adequate remuneration for their labor; inferior workmen in getting no work whatever in dull seasons. For, when all are paid alike, the most skillful will be longest retained. It may be thought there is sufficient compensation in the varying conditions of work to satisfy both classes. Anyhow, if unionists voluntarily subscribe to such a rule, greater injustice is done to themselves than to any one else.

Employers say this equality of wages tends to deteriorate the quality of labor performed. The desire of the workman to excel and do his best is deadened by the system to which he has submitted. This is

quite evident without much inquiry. If better workmen get no higher pay for the exercise of greater skill, their latent capacities will not be called forth. Man will not exert himself much without the hope of a reward, and certainly there is none in the case of a society whose members all consent to labor for equal pay. To this unionists reply that inferior workmen are stimulated to improve so as to get an advance of wages. While this ought to be expected of them, the fact is otherwise. The more skillful workmen fall down to the level of the less skillful; no half-way improvement even occurs. There is no denying this. It cannot be questioned that a system of remuneration which prevents workmen from putting forth their best energies is wrong, and not to be encouraged. Higher wages would be paid, superior articles would be produced, did workmen exercise greater skill. With all the vast improvements making, workmen ought to be stimulated to do their best, and keep pace with the wants of the age. But, if they are not encouraged by higher wages, and submit to a system preventing payment of them, where is the incentive for exercising superior genius? Thus trade-unions fail to call forth the skill of the better portion of their membership, and, as a corollary to this, deprive them of getting the highest wages they might receive.

Were the most skillful the best paid, their ambition to improve would be aroused. Naturally, every one is desirous of acquiring the highest remuneration possible, and the strongest inducement to earn it is to pay the highest wages to those who perform the greatest service.



Though we see no moral wrong in trade-unions establishing a *minimum* rate of wages, so long as it is purely voluntary, it is easy to see how injuriously the rule operates with the members. First, the more skillful workmen receive less pay and perform poorer work; secondly, inferior workmen do not improve so rapidly and have not so strong an incentive to acquire greater skill, and are the first to be thrown out of employment in dull periods, because when all are paid the same price the most skillful are longest retained; in the third place, employers suffer from the inferior quality of work; and lastly, the public suffer from the inferior product.

Nearly all trade-unions prescribe a *minimum* rate of wages, though none fix a *maximum*, and it is an error to suppose that unionists always seek to equalize wages. In the "Fifteenth Annual Report of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners," the secretary of the society, in speaking for its members, begins the subject by saying: "We are continually charged with repressing individual merit, and dragging all men down to one common level. That this is altogether untrue our members well know; they are aware that whilst we endeavor to fix a *minimum* rate of wages, and to admit only those into our ranks who are capable of fairly earning that rate, we fix no *maximum* rate of wages, and are always glad to see exceptional ability rewarded by an increased remuneration. We are desirous of offering every possible facility to those who desire to develop their ability as workmen." To this end, an annual scholarship of five hundred and twenty-five dollars has been



established, to be awarded to the member most proficient in architectural drawing, building construction, and the practical application of scientific principles to the trade of a carpenter and joiner.

Another thought of Mr. Oliver's may be mentioned here: "Without some means of self-protection to workmen, capital always tends to bring the wages of the good workmen to the level of the wages of the bad, and to reduce the wages of the bad still lower." This is a good defense for prescribing a *minimum* rate of wages, but not for setting a higher limit, as is often done. Perhaps by fixing a uniform rate for all it can be more regularly maintained, so that, if the most skilled are not always adequately rewarded, the remuneration may average higher during a long period than would be the case were varying rates paid to the workmen.

In this connection let us consider the question of piece-work. In the United States unions have not objected much to piece-work; but they have in Great Britain. All have perfect freedom to contract in their own way. In Great Britain masters make every effort to induce their workmen to labor by the piece; while the latter very strenuously object to working in this manner.

Their reason for this is a double one: namely, the task is not so well performed; besides, such a mode of working tends to weaken the power of the unions. They contend it is for the interest of the public, as well as themselves, to object to piece-work. This view, however, employers almost universally deny. Said Mr. Robinson, the engineer of the Atlas Works,

Manchester, England, in commenting upon the statement of a trade-union secretary that piece-work, as a general rule, is inferior: "The plan of doing piece-work in an establishment like ours has led to such a reputation for our work that we can get a higher price than other firms." This objection to piece-work may be dismissed as not based on fact.

The remaining objection urged by workmen against piece-work—that it tends to break up the cohesion of their organization—contains more force. So long as men remain in a similar condition, working according to the same rule, greater unity of interest naturally exists than when each man is working for himself. It is policy for trade-unions to sustain this rule so far as practicable. Isolation tends to weakness; were each man laboring for himself, regardless of those around him, doubtless we should hear but little of strikes. "Where each man makes a separate contract with his employer," say Messrs. Hughes and Harrison, very correctly, "he finds that, being the weaker, he gets often the worst of the bargain. The workmen very naturally prefer to treat in a body."

Whether they receive better pay in working by the piece or not is a difficult question to answer. Some affirm that wages could be more easily reduced did piece-work prevail, and workmen in Great Britain claim they would be lower than they are; we know of no way to decide the point.

Other rules of a minor character, aiming to repress competition and increase work for unionists, require brief notice. We will mention some of them adopted by trade-unions in Manchester, England.

Firstly, as to brickmakers :

No person is allowed to make bricks by machinery.

Secondly, as to bricklayers :

1. No bricklayer allowed to set machine-made bricks.
2. No master-bricklayer to have more than three apprentices.
3. No bricks to be used in Manchester that are made beyond an arbitrarily-fixed boundary-line, averaging about three and a half miles from the Exchange.
4. No bricks to be wheeled in a barrow.
5. Laborers not to go up one ladder and come down another.
6. Masters must employ men resident in Manchester at all their works within fifteen miles of the city.
7. Every bricklayer to have one laborer to attend upon him, whether there is work for the latter to do or not.
8. All foremen-bricklayers to be members of the union.

Thirdly, as to masons :

1. No quarry-worked stone allowed to come into Manchester.
2. No ashlar (walling-stone) to be worked by machinery.
3. All masons, bricklayers, and plasterers (whatever they are worth) are to have the same rate of wages, according to their respective trades.
4. Masons not to work overtime on any consideration.

To these might be added the rules enforced by some unions, confining each class of workmen strictly to their own division of labor : for example, restricting

masons from ever setting or displacing a brick, or bricklayers a stone, or either class from doing any work belonging to a plasterer. Another rule, called "chasing," prohibits the leading man, where several of them are working in a line, from proceeding at more than a moderate rate. Other rules of like character might be mentioned.

Such are the principal rules by means of which these organizations attempt to limit the number of working-men in any branch of industry, and to create a monopoly of work in order to increase wages.

No one can fail to see that while the leading aim of unionists is a very noble one,—to divide the profits of labor more equally among all by repressing competition,—the methods of obtaining this end are often cruel and unjust. Perhaps they are the best and only ones that can be devised; whether this be so or not, they are seriously defective. Trade-unions can never gain much support beyond their own body so long as persons are prevented from obtaining work because of age or sex. Happily, many of these rules are not enforced by all unions, and the sooner they are completely abolished the better.

In framing them trade-unions are perfectly frank, and declare they seek no interest besides their own. Said Mr. Conolly, a leading unionist, before the Trade-Unions Commission: "The rules are made for men, not for masters; . . . we merely look upon them as men who step in with their capital, and who want to get the greatest profit they can out of their capital; while we want to get the greatest profit we can out of our labor."



We shall now leave these less direct methods for increasing wages to consider a much shorter method, namely, strikes. These have become so frequent, are conducted on so large a scale, and often are so disastrous, as to create much anxiety concerning future production and trade. It is an unwelcome fact that English builders very generally decline to build any structure requiring much time to complete, through fear of the workmen making unreasonable demands and striking upon refusal to comply, thus rendering it impossible, perhaps, for contractors to fulfill their engagements. So they contract more by the day, increasing the expense to the owner, who receives no advantage therefrom.

Strikes, which in the fourteenth century had their counterpart in the Jacquerie riots, are the last thing for the laborer to resort to in order to get an advance of wages. As for the justice of them, if workmen are not getting a reasonable price for their labor, and their employers refuse to pay more, after working the length of time agreed upon they are justified in quitting their places.

In England, workmen have oftener struck to resist a fall than to secure a rise of wages. Says Mr. Brassey: "Resistance to a proposed reduction was the cause of the engineers' strike in 1852; of the strike at Preston in 1853; of the strike in the iron trade in 1865; and of the strike of the colliers, at Wigen, in 1868." The strikes in the United States have generally sprung from a similar cause. The weavers at a cotton-mill in New York having had their wages reduced three cents a yard, struck to regain the old price; the



sounding-board makers in a piano-factory struck on account of a threatened reduction of ten per cent. in their wages; one thousand operatives employed in a carpet-manufactory in New York struck against a similar proposed reduction; the pottery-men of Trenton, New Jersey, were on a strike which lasted several months, causing a loss of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the employers and of fifty thousand dollars more to themselves, determined to accept no reduction for their labor; the cordwainers of New York struck for a period of nine months against a proposed reduction of twenty per cent.; and other instances might be noted. What Mr. Brassey has observed concerning English strikes applies to all those mentioned: "Masters had found it necessary, in consequence of the depressed state of trade, to reduce the rate of wages; but the men, ignoring the circumstances of the trade, and looking only to what they believed to be a degradation of their position as workmen, refused to accept the reduction." This remark is emphatically true of the strikes which have occurred in the United States during the last twelve months. Profits have greatly declined, prices in general have been heavily shrinking, and a reduction of wages in most cases was absolutely necessary. Yet never have so many and so severe strikes occurred during the same period; never were they so causeless.

Much as these sad affairs may be regretted, they cannot be laid to the door of trade-unions. All the members of the Trade-Unions Commission were in accord on this point concerning English strikes, and the language used in the leading and dissenting

reports is almost the same. To quote from the chief one: "It does not appear to be borne out by the evidence that the disposition to strike on the part of the workmen is in itself the creation of unionism, or that the frequency of strikes increases in proportion to the strength of the union. It is, indeed, affirmed by the leaders of unions that the effect of the established societies is to diminish the frequency, and certainly the disorder of strikes, and to guarantee a regularity of wages and hours rather than to engage in constant endeavors to improve them."

This evidence throws into bold relief a good feature of trade-unions. Admitted upon the best authority that they are not the authors of strikes, the strongest, richest, and most extended of these organizations have had the fewest strikes and disputes, while the wages of their members and their hours of labor show the greatest permanence. The society of engineers, of which Mr. Allan is secretary, is very numerous, embracing the principal portion of the workmen engaged in that business in Great Britain. At one time the society had a reserve fund of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. So great is their power, that Mr. Beyer, a partner in one of the largest iron-foundries in England, represented himself as wholly in the control of the union. But their wages, notwithstanding their power, have been scarcely raised for twenty-five years except by the voluntary act of their masters.

The feeblest unions, those just struggling into existence perhaps, or which have the least control over their members, oftenest indulge in strikes. Not in-

frequently unions are formed when the spirit for striking is rife; and, consequently, they are charged with instituting strikes which would have happened whether unions existed or not. When men are dissatisfied with their wages, they can easily subscribe a small fund for the purpose of striking and create a union which is not intended to exist beyond the occasion giving it birth. The proceedings of such bodies ought not in justice to be charged to the regularly constituted union. It was said of the English tailors' and ironworkers' unions that they "never possessed the power or the permanent character of such societies as the Amalgamated Engineers and Amalgamated Carpenters," and these are the trades in which the loudest complaints are heard of the frequency of strikes. Numerous strikes and lockouts have occurred in the coal-mining districts of Wales and Derbyshire, but no unions have flourished in those regions. In the United States most of the unions are young, hardly in working order, having no accumulated funds, the discipline exercised being exceedingly lax; the machine in every way bearing evidence of hasty and rude construction.

Several unions were recently created during a strike, or with special reference to it. Thus the hated trade-unions are unjustly accused of originating grave evils which would have happened in any event. As these organizations grow older and more stable, and select more capable leaders, they will be managed with greater wisdom, and capital will have less cause to fear them.

It is questioned whether the diminished frequency of strikes among powerful unions arises from any want

of disposition to strike on the part of the members, but from the fact that their organization is so powerful as, in most cases, to obtain the concession demanded without recourse to this measure. Perhaps this is so, but surely it will not be denied that the Trade-Unions Commission, who raised this query, did not glean a scintilla of evidence upon the point in their most thorough, and in every way creditable, investigation. We can comprehend what influence these powerful organizations could exert, if they chose, and how masters had better submit to their demands, though declaring them wrong, than go through the painful uncertainty of a strike. In several instances masters have confessed themselves within the power of trade-unions; if this be true, they could obtain new concessions without a conflict of any kind. Possibly, if several of the societies were less strong, they might not have received some of the benefits which have come to them peaceably; and perhaps none at all. We repeat, this may be so; but there is no evidence on the subject. The fact is, the larger organizations have been guided by wiser counsels, and were more content with their situation. In many of them, as previously seen, wages have not been raised much for a long period, and yet strikes have rarely occurred.

The reason why the richer and more powerful unions moderate the disposition for strikes is not merely to conserve their funds, nor because they obtain concessions by reason of their power, but because they are more wisely conducted than the newer and smaller organizations. The government of each branch of the union is vested in a committee and local secre-



tary elected from time to time by the members, while the government of the whole society is commonly vested in a general or executive council elected by the branches, and a general secretary elected by universal suffrage of the entire organization. Both the executive council and the committee of the several branches are required to govern themselves according to established rules, and when these are silent, they must rely upon their judgment, subject to an appeal to the general body. Instituting and conducting strikes is the most important function of every well-organized union's council. It is these councils which have toned down the disposition of workmen so much in regard to strikes. For, generally, the best men are selected for these places, men of the most intelligence, and who are the best capable of ascertaining the condition and profits of the business in which workmen are employed. These leaders, from their superior knowledge and capability to find out the true condition of business, can judge better than the members; and hence it is that strikes in the larger and more wisely conducted unions are diminishing. And this we regard as a very hopeful feature of trade-unions. One thing the toiling classes need is correct information concerning the business in which they are engaged. They imagine their employers are getting very rich oftentimes, when they are running at a loss, though keeping the fact concealed. The strikes which have recently occurred in the cotton-mills of New England are unanswerable proof of this remark. Most of them have earned no profits for several months, yet the operatives have foolishly demanded



an increase of wages. Had they known anything about the condition of trade, they would have comprehended the folly of asking for an advance when employers were keeping them busy at a loss. Personal knowledge or wise leadership would have saved them from a contest with their employers which was sure to end in the laborers' defeat. They were the dupes of ignorant and wild leaders, instead of wise and temperate ones, and behold the result! Every man who knew anything about the condition of the cotton trade was certain the strikes would end in failure, for, in fact, the owners were quite as willing to have the men unemployed as not. Prejudice and ill feeling between employed and employer help kindle the laboring man's imagination respecting the profits accruing from his labor. Now, the leaders of unions are in a situation to learn more perfectly the exact nature of things, and this is why they advise more peaceful measures.

Here a streak of light issues from these organizations, especially since the establishment of boards of arbitration and conciliation for the settlement of differences between men and masters. Members having confidence in their councils are able to submit questions to third parties for settlement. They could do what would be impossible were they unorganized. Should all the men in a shop strike and the attempt be made to leave the differences between them and their masters to some person for arbitration, the difficulty would be in organizing the workmen for consultation; even were a temporary organization formed, and representatives selected from their number to con-

fer with their employers, they would not command such confidence as those who were recognized as watching over their interests and thoroughly knowing the condition of business.

It is asserted that these very councils foment strikes when they ought not. Being paid officers, they regard it as part of their duty, it is said, to advise striking occasionally. This is thought to be their occupation. They are chosen to wage war, not to maintain peace. These notions are erroneous. Only a very few persons connected with trade-unions receive any pecuniary reward, nor do they constantly agitate for higher wages and other benefits. This, we suppose, they do in some cases; yet it is quite clear that, in general, the tendency of their advice and counsel is to moderate the striking disposition of those under their direction and control. Strikes began long before trade-unions were ever thought of; they are the incident of collecting men in masses as they have been collected by the erection of factories. The union does give an increased power of striking, it can deal a harder blow, but, instead of giving it, an increased sense of order, subordination, and reflection are exhibited. Does any one doubt the truth of this? Listen to what the General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners says in his last report: "Our demands on our employers for wages and reduced working hours, which have been moderate in their character, and which have been a consequence, not a cause, of the enhanced cost of the necessities of life, have generally been courteously conceded, and thus our disputes have been few and

unimportant. I sincerely trust that an amicable relationship between employers and employed may be permanently maintained. Although we may be told that in accordance with the law of supply and demand we are justified in pressing for all the advantages we can possibly obtain in busy times, and that we should accept whatever may be offered to us when trade is depressed, I hold that such a policy is advantageous neither to employer or employed, and cannot benefit the general public. Wherever our employers are disposed to meet us in a fair and conciliatory spirit, our members will do well to meet them with equal cordiality, to carefully consider any arguments that may be advanced, and thoroughly examine both sides of the question at issue. If employers and workmen are determined to act fairly by their opponents, as well as to secure justice to themselves, matters of detail may be arranged, differences amicably settled, and results secured which would be far more satisfactory to all parties than anything which could be obtained by a strike or lockout." Who can find fault with this advice, or maintain that men are not better off under such leadership than they would be, each one struggling for himself? Do not these words give promise of restored harmony between capital and labor? Surely trade-unions thus directed ought to be encouraged, not condemned.

The method of instituting strikes is often exceedingly harsh and unfair towards the employer, especially in the United States. In Great Britain it is usually preceded by an intimation that if the concession demanded be not granted the men will quit work in a body. If

this intimation fails to produce the desired effect, the case is ordinarily brought before the governing body of the union, and if the proposed proceeding is approved, the strike is organized and the men are called off work. But in the United States they do not proceed in such a deliberate and methodical way.

Mr. Hewitt narrated in his testimony before the Trade-Unions Commission how the thing was done in America. "When I came away there was a strike in New Jersey at the iron-mines, which supply a large number of furnaces with ore. Without notice at all to the owners the workmen in a single mine suddenly stopped work. They never made any request to have their wages raised, but marched to the next mine and told the workmen there that they had inaugurated a strike, and directed them to desist from work. And out of that mine (I know the facts perfectly well, for it was my own mine), they came out from fear; they all said so. They then marched to the adjacent mines, eighteen or nineteen in number, and stopped the whole work in forty-eight hours (the area being comparatively small), and they marched in bodies of fifteen hundred to two thousand without committing violence upon anybody except this: they found some teams of ore being carted down to the canal; they took the horses out of the wagon so as to leave the team standing in the road, and told the drivers that if they undertook to put them in again they would be punished. Consequently, the whole business of that region was suspended. But the banks of the canal being filled with ore, the companies proceeded to load their boats and send them along the canal to supply the furnaces. The



miners then came down and compelled the boatmen to leave their boats, and finally, fearing that they might get through anyhow, they filled up the canal for a considerable distance with ore so as to make it entirely impassable. We applied to the canal company, in the first instance, to help us, and they said their duty would be confined to clearing their canal, which they did promptly. Then we applied to the Governor for a military force to protect the boatmen and the men working in the canal. He promptly assented, and as soon as they found that the furnaces were likely to be supplied for the next three or four months they returned to work."

Who will question the rudeness of this method, or that trade-unions would gain in power did they proceed in a fairer manner? The following instance serves to show how a strike was conducted among the waiters at the principal hotels in New York: They simultaneously struck for an increase of pay from five dollars, per month, with board, to thirty dollars,—an advance of twenty per cent. They maliciously selected the dining hour for quitting their employers; after serving the first course of the repast, they marched out of the various hotels in a body. The employers were enabled to obtain a supply in a few days; and in the end the strikers were most injured, for neither they nor any belonging to unions can obtain employment at the hotels where the strike took place.

The method pursued in Great Britain is evidently wiser and will command more respect. So long as these organizations seek to take advantage of the sit-



uation of their employers in unfair ways, or at critical times, they will not receive any sympathy from the public. It is true they are sometimes duped and led to strike by the action of their employers, and when this is the case, the conduct of the latter cannot be too severely condemned. For example, in 1870 a strike occurred among the miners in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania, which lasted nearly six months. The movement was begun by the speculators and coal corporations interested in maintaining the price of fuel. The miners alleged no grievance whatever. During the spring of that year, which had succeeded an unusually mild winter, a stock of fuel, estimated at seven hundred thousand tons, remained unsold. The existence of so large a surplus, it was feared, would cause a reduction in the price of coal, so it was determined to stop production. This could not be done without giving the public some sort of excuse. So measures were taken with the miners which, it was expected, would lead them to strike. They, ignorant of the trap set for them, fell into it, though when they did resume work higher wages were demanded and obtained.

Such proceedings, whether on the part of masters or men, cannot be justified. We do not mean to imply that when business is very brisk and employers are reaping rich harvests, workmen ought to remain silent and be content with the wages paid in dull seasons. Not at all, for this would be giving them over entirely to the mercy of their employers. But the latter should have fair warning of the intention of their laborers, so as to adjust all differences if possible.

To do like the waiters of the New York hotels, or some of the coal companies of Pennsylvania, is only to widen the breach between the two classes without accomplishing any good.

We now proceed to inquire whether trade-unions through strikes have been successful in enhancing wages, or preventing a fall. This inquiry is fraught with deep importance, for, as the principal object in creating unions is to secure more adequate remuneration for labor, so, if they have failed to do this, their worth to their founders is correspondingly diminished. In truth, if wages are no better maintained with, than without, these societies, it is not worth the cost of continuing them. And we have no doubt unionists will agree with us in the conclusion.

It was the opinion of the Commission to which we have often referred, that trade-unions had had some influence in bringing up wages more speedily than would have happened otherwise. This statement, it must be remembered, merely refers to the cases where an increase has happened. But what has been the influence of the organization regarded in its entirety? Mark the answer: "We think it doubtful whether the net earnings of the workmen connected with unions have not, on the whole, been diminished rather than increased through the agency of the unions; while it is unquestionable that in many cases large bodies of unskilled laborers, in numbers often exceeding those of the skilled workmen, are rendered destitute by strikes which they, being unconnected with the unions, have no means of preventing or controlling."

To the same effect are the words of Mr. Brassey, whose intimate knowledge of the subject well qualifies him to express an opinion: "Their organized and united action may secure an advance of wages at a somewhat earlier date; but eventually, in the great majority of cases, the competition among employers would bring about equally beneficial results to the working people. The advantage to the working classes of obtaining the advance at an earlier date is not, in my honest opinion, sufficient to compensate for the expense of perpetually maintaining by heavy subscriptions a trade-union organization; still less to compensate for the great loss which is caused by unsuccessful strikes."

It is impossible to answer this question with exactness, for no one can tell what the wages of workmen would have been in the absence of strikes. Nor can it be ascertained how much capital by ill-advised strikes has been driven from the field of production and loaned. In every pursuit, and everywhere, wages have advanced, but this is not due to the influence of trade-unions, for their operations are confined to a limited sphere. Upon the authority of Mr. Graham, one of the largest cabinet-manufacturers in London, the salaries of assistants in wholesale warehouses and retail shops, both male and female, have risen in the average about fifty per cent. within forty years, with a reduction in the hours of attendance. Every one knows there has never been any combination to raise the salaries of clerks in stores in the United States, or the wages of common workmen who are employed around the streets or on farms. Consider the wages

of house servants. They have advanced very considerably within ten years, in fact, often more than doubled, and without the shadow of a combination. Is not the statement true that non-unionists have had their wages increased quite as much in proportion as those belonging to the unions? We think the facts give this answer.

Let us look at the countries of continental Europe. In all, wages have risen considerably; yet in some of them laborers were not permitted to combine for the purpose of securing an increase of wages until a very recent period. Thus in Austria, where wages have advanced very considerably within fifteen years, prior to 1867 the law provided that workmen, apprentices, etc., combining for the purpose of organizing strikes or otherwise forcibly raising the rate of wages, were trespassers, and punishable accordingly. Nor was the statute a dead letter, for in 1866, under the Belcredi ministry, when the tanners struck for higher wages, the affair was summarily settled by wholesale imprisonment, and many of the men emigrated. It is true, in 1870, when the saw-grinders struck for an advance of pay, they were released by the court before whom they were brought charged with conspiracy to raise the rate of wages, contrary to the existing law, upon the ground that the bill relating to trade-unions permitting men to combine for the purpose of securing a rise of wages, although not a law, would probably be enacted, as proved to be the case.

Switzerland was free from strikes until they were instigated by the International Workingmen's Society; yet wages there have not remained stationary. They



began to rise long before the International was born. Nowhere are workmen so content and upon such pleasant terms with their masters. In one country at least, Switzerland, have workmen learned how identical are their own and their employers' interests, and how much more can be gained by preserving friendly relations than by open and bitter opposition. The intershock of classes is avoided, rather than sought, in every possible way by all.

It cannot be affirmed that the general rise of wages is due to the influence of organizations created principally for this purpose. We do not maintain that trade-unions have never succeeded in enhancing wages. But the question is, whether they would not have reached as high figures by the voluntary action of employers. During the civil war in the United States wages rose very high, not by virtue of any combination among workmen to force them up, but on account of the scarcity of labor and the great profits flowing from almost every pursuit. The strikes in the United States have been principally to resist a fall, not to get an advance. Strikes have multiplied rapidly within a few years, when employers have been seeking to reduce wages; not during the period when they were rising. It is within the knowledge of all that strikes did not occur during the gilded and delusive period of American industry when everybody received high prices,—the manufacturer for his product, the operative for his labor, and every one else according to his effort. This proves that in the United States trade-unions had no influence in raising the rate of wages; furthermore, when the flood tide of prices was run-



ning, these societies did not exist in any strength. Within seven or eight years only have they been important enough to attract any attention. The rise of wages, therefore, in the United States was wholly due to other causes than combination among workmen.

In England, too, in those parts of the country where trade-unions do not exist, are witnessed the same fluctuations in the labor market, the same rise and fall of wages, depending upon the demand for labor, as occurs under the influence of trade-unions. At the Dowlais iron-works in South Wales, where ten thousand men are employed, no trade-union was ever heard of until recently ; yet wages have fluctuated as freely, according to the varying circumstances of trade, there, as elsewhere. The terrible strike in that part of the country early in 1875 cannot be justly charged to unionism, for no society was organized until a few days before the event occurred. It would have happened anyhow, whether a union existed there or not. Nor is it less true of the entire section of country, that notwithstanding the absence of these societies, those employed have been as well paid as in any part of Great Britain. In some of the iron-works non-unionists have received higher wages than members of unions. Mr. Markham, manager of the Staveley Iron and Coal Company's Works, testified before the Trade-Unions Commission that no trade-union had existed in his district for twenty years, nevertheless he believed wages were higher than in any other part of the country where unions flourished.

Now, if it be true unionists have received no higher wages than would have come to them in any event,

surely in making up a general profit and loss account the latter side will be the heaviest. For, in the first place, must be noted the unsuccessful strikes to obtain a rise, or maintain the rate, of wages. Mr. Thornton has summed up the result of some of the numerous strikes in England happening within the last twenty-five years, but a detailed account of them, and many others besides, will be found in Ward's "Workmen and Wages." We shall merely mention the great strike of the Manchester spinners in 1829, when one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars wages were forfeited; the Ashton and Staleybridge strikes of 1829 and 1830, participated in by thirty thousand spinners, who lost one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars; the strikes of the Tyne and Wear pitmen in 1832, which were very protracted; the Manchester builders' strike in 1833, when three hundred and sixty thousand dollars of wages were lost; the "terrible" strikes of the Preston spinners: first, in 1836, lasting thirteen weeks and costing the men two hundred and eighty-six thousand dollars; and secondly, in 1854, when seventeen thousand persons went into voluntary idleness, suffering intensely for thirty-eight weeks, and giving up two million one hundred thousand dollars of wages; the engineers' strike in 1853, of fifteen weeks' duration, in which two hundred and fifteen thousand dollars wages were sacrificed; the strike in the metropolitan building trade in 1860; and the strikes of the iron-workers of Staffordshire and the North in 1865, and of the London tailors in 1868; these are a few of the more prominent instances.

In the second place, when advances are secured by striking, very often they are of short duration, so that the gain does not compensate for the loss incurred during the period of idleness. Thus, at the present time, the price of labor is receding in many employments, and advances won by strikes have sunk out of sight. The strike is a very costly expedient, and, unless the advance be large or long continued, in the end does not pay. For example, the second strike among the Preston spinners, to which we have previously alluded, lasted thirty-eight weeks, and two million one hundred thousand dollars of wages were forfeited. They demanded ten per cent. increase. Had they succeeded, it would have required five years to repay the loss,—a period much too long to count upon with safety. How few of the advances made within fifteen years, especially in the United States, have been fully maintained? After the panic of 1870 there was a very general reduction by railway companies of ten per cent. on the wages of all, including the chief officers. This tendency may be observed everywhere at the present time. Profits have diminished, and competition is so sharp that wages must be cut down in order for business to thrive at all. One reason for this, doubtless, is over-production; markets are too full to command fair prices, and the only refuge for manufacturers is to reduce wages.

Again, whenever unions have had the longest, most expensive, and bitterest conflicts in obtaining a rise of wages, they have the most speedily fallen, and for the very obvious reason, that, there being the least

justice for granting the advance, so did the necessity earliest arise for taking the advance off.

In the third place, those strikes which were originated to prevent a fall have generally been the most disastrous to the working class. For when wages have been advanced by the voluntary action of employers, slowly do they fall; and manufacturers often continue to pay them after profits have sunk into insignificance, or perhaps have entirely ceased. Employers seldom or never ask their help to accept a lower rate of wages until the condition of their trade has become so unfavorable as to make the reduction absolutely necessary. Whenever, therefore, a reduction is determined upon, unions rarely have prevented a fall. In the summer of 1874 nearly all the blast furnaces in the Cleveland district, which produces one-third of the iron made in Great Britain, were within a few days of being blown out in consequence of a strike among the iron-stone miners lasting six weeks. Many of the furnaces were damped down at a very serious loss to the owners, and the miners, after enduring great hardships, submitted unconditionally to the reduction of wages proposed by the mine-owners, at a loss of three hundred thousand dollars, which would have been earned during the period of inactivity had they continued to labor.

Recent experience in the United States has shown how powerless are trade-unions to maintain the rate of wages when business is drooping. The strike of the miners in Pennsylvania in 1875 cost them three million two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars, and they gained nothing. The strikes among the



iron-workers at Pittsburg, the operatives at Fall River, Lowell, Taftville, and other places were long protracted and unsuccessful. At Taftville thirty-five thousand dollars wages were thrown away; the Fall River strike which occurred in August and September, 1870, cost the workmen three hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and the "Mule-Spinners' Strike" at Lowell in 1875 kept twelve thousand and thirty-five dollars and fifty-one cents from the pockets of the operatives working in the mills of the Merrimack Manufacturing Company.

Millions of dollars of wages have been sacrificed in the United States during the last five years by unionists without any corresponding gain. What is the conclusion to be drawn from these facts? Clearly this,—that strikes do not pay. In the most favorable event they are a very costly remedy. When a strike proves ineffectual the loss is total, without any saving. Even when the end is gained, often the advantage is not equal to the loss incurred. The victory is a barren one. To win another such perhaps would be destruction to the victors. Granted that strikes are proper remedies to procure higher wages, the utility of them for this purpose must be tested by the financial standard; and, according to that, they are unprofitable. The loss is greater than the gain. This much concerning the pecuniary aspect of strikes.

Then there is additional loss to laborers who are not members of unions, and who are averse to such methods for raising wages. It seems hardly less than cruel to inflict loss upon those who would prefer to work, who are satisfied with the wages they are re-



ceiving, and who believe that the contemplated strike will prove a failure. Yet this is repeatedly done.

Another consideration must not be left out of sight; namely, in forcing up wages, unless the advance be actually paid out of the profits of the employer, workmen gain nothing in the end. In other words, if wages are forced up, and, as a consequence, the employer sells his products for an advance sufficient to cover the additional price paid to the laborer, he is not benefited by the rise. For, when the employer instead of bearing this new burden throws it upon the shoulders of the community, the laboring classes bear their share in common with the rest. It is true the employer first pays the increase of wages, but when it is added to the cost of production the consumers and not the employers are the sufferers. The public, therefore, pay the increased wages; not, indeed, directly to the workmen, but to the manufacturers, and thus the question of a rise in wages is in most cases a question between the artisan and those who purchase the product of his toil. To this he replies, whenever wages rise other things do not, as a consequence, rise in proportion, so that he is a gainer. This has been admirably answered by Mr. Booth: "Those who use this argument seem to forget that the unionists are bound to allow to every other class of producers the same means of enhancing the price of their productions as they claim for themselves; and, if this system could be pursued through all branches of industry, it would simply come to this,—that each class could be taxed in its turn for the benefit of all other classes, and so we should arrive at a general system

of production, the only advantage to the members of the trade-unions being that they would have the power of taxing, for their benefit, that large class of workmen who cannot be admitted to the unions: for example, a very large majority of the working classes, together with the rest of the community not comprised within the trade-unions." It is probably true that when any one secures an advance on the former price of a thing, whether labor, machinery, coal, or grain, he is a gainer for a season, but every person is seeking either to get upon an equal plane with his fellows, or above them. This they must do in self-protection. When an advance takes place in the price of labor the employer asks more for his products, the landlord a higher rent, the merchant more for his groceries and clothing; and so the workman finds the advance obtained to be not a real but a delusive one. The price of one thing having risen, the cycle must be completed before the rise stops. Can the workman get a larger share of the profits accruing to the employer,—in other words, can he get an advance of wages,—and goods be sold at the old rates? In such cases, and such only, is he truly benefited by an increase of pay. Before striking or demanding additional wages, workmen ought to consider well whether they will be really paid by the employer or by the public; for if the latter is the case, they merely put money into one pocket to be taken out again without receiving the slightest benefit therefrom.

Another fact workmen should remember before demanding higher wages: namely, if employers are to throw off the advance upon consumers, production

will be checked, as every turn of the screw enhancing price checks demand. Lessen this, and the price of labor must fall again, or workmen be thrown out of employment. We admit that a rise of wages, so far as wealthy consumers who do not produce anything are concerned, would be real, for they could not affect the advance, as they have nothing to sell; but such persons are only a small portion of any community. Besides, they would curtail their demands. Had they nothing to part with the price of which they could raise and so wreak their revenge, they would cut down their purchases all the more quickly. Thus, we are brought once more to the stubborn fact that an advance of wages not paid out of profits which the employer either does, or expects to make, is thrown off upon the public, becomes an additional tax which workmen in common with the rest of the community are obliged to pay.

Let not our readers think we are opposed to the working classes because we have taken such a sombre view of their efforts to increase wages. Undoubtedly, they often suffer, and many of their demands for increased remuneration are probably just, but these things have nothing to do with our inquiry. The question is, Do they obtain what they desire by means of strikes? can they get their dues in this way? In showing how poorly they have succeeded, how impossible it is for them to get an advance, unless it comes out of the profits of employers instead of being thrown off as a tax upon the public, we are not in any way touching upon the justice of their claims. We are merely showing how difficult, nay, impossible

in many cases, it is to get an advance; not that it is unjust and ought not be granted.

We are now in sight of another fact which workmen have always forgotten, and are likely to forget many times more before they learn the lesson it ought to teach. The fact is this: by securing too great an advance of wages, or rupturing the trade of an employer for too long a period, it is lost forever. The Trade-Unions Commission examined this question in their thorough and most creditable manner, but were compelled to admit their inability to arrive "at any very definite solution of the problem." It cannot be perfectly solved, for when production declines, it does not follow that unionism has caused the result; as Messrs. Hughes and Harrison have said, it may be due to over-production or imprudent speculation, to a glut of the home market, to the opening of new facilities elsewhere, and the natural development of a new competing market. It may be the result of increased means of communication and transport, or to changes in the money-market in the new competing district or country. It may be due to great political causes, like civil or foreign war, to the opening of new railways, to the formation of commercial treaties and alliances, to "monetary panics" and "commercial manias"; in a word, to a crowd of social, political, and economic events. The decline of trade may happen from several co-operating causes; when such is the case, it is not fair to ascribe the decline to any one thing.

Leaving, therefore, the results of the British investigation, we will note a few facts bearing upon this



question which none can dispute. In a previous chapter we showed how the Antwerp cigar-makers, by their continued persistence in striking, destroyed to a great extent the business upon which they depended for a living. A large portion of the foreign trade had been with Great Britain. The introduction of the trade there was owing to two causes; first, to the operation of trade-unions in Great Britain whereby the wages of workmen were increased; and secondly, to the exorbitant profits expected by the English manufacturer. Trade-unions in Great Britain were a co-operating cause in driving the business away from there in the beginning, while its return is wholly due to the influence of the same organization in Belgium, which by frequent and groundless strikes has nearly ruined the cigar manufacture of the whole country.

Another strike occurring in the State of Nevada, if not so disastrous to so many people as the one last mentioned, was born not less of ignorance and fanaticism. In the silver mines of Grass Valley, three hundred Cornish miners, who were receiving four dollars a day, struck upon the introduction of a new kind of blasting-powder which was found to effect a considerable saving of labor. They insisted upon following the Cornish system of mining; the result was that the mines were closed forever. What became of those Cornish miners, whose stubbornness seemed to be their chief endowment, we are unable to state.

In France, too, it is asserted "that the work-people, by striking for wages when they know that their em-



ployers have a time-contract on hand, can force ruin upon the latter, and that many contracts have been rejected owing to the impossibility of working them at a profit while the price of labor may be artificially raised." These contracts, it is asserted, pass into the hands of foreign manufacturers, who have not yet fallen under the control of their workmen: and the trade of the country suffers in this way the most serious detriment.

These instances explicitly prove how workmen put away the bread from their own mouths and those of their children, by permitting their greed for wages to triumph over reason. It should be, and doubtless is, the universal wish that workmen will seek to do the best thing possible for themselves, but they must learn the truth concerning the identity of their own and their masters' interests. If this is not believed, and the opposite principle practiced, of getting the highest wages regardless of the interest of their employers, the working classes will sooner or later find themselves in company with those furnishing employment, shipwrecked. This may not be the case with those trades which do not compete, that are local, like house-building; but excepting such occupations, it is possible to press wages so high in some localities as to cause the ruin of its business through competition. This is exceedingly sharp wherever it can be introduced, and a slight circumstance is sufficient to turn it away from one place and give it to another. Workmen should consider well this point, and remember that what they have done in the past they may do again,—destroy the trade of a city or country forever.

It is no wonder, especially in the old world, where competition is so keen, and dependence upon foreign markets so vital to the prosperity of the country, that the unreasoning conduct of the laboring classes is often looked upon with great solicitude as endangering the prosperity of employer and employed alike, and consequently the nation itself. It is ignorance which inspires the working classes to act contrary to their own interests. If they were trying to inform themselves upon what slender threads their future employment and prosperity were hanging, the anxiety which many now feel would diminish. Unhappily, this is not often the case. Ignorance and prejudice are enthroned in the bosom of the laborer, and argument proves of little avail. The American workman does not yet realize that the higher the point to which his wages are raised, the more is he exposed to the certain effects of foreign competition. For, to raise his wages is to cut down the dam shutting out the overflow of foreign production. To be content with a fair division of profits, to do good work and keep production steady, is the surest guarantee for employment during the years to come. The prosperity of the working-man is within his own achievement, but there is danger of his making shipwreck of his opportunities, and sinking both his employer and himself by his stubborn and inexcusable disregard of the many lights which are set to warn him of the peril to which he is constantly exposed. Nothing can more delight the iron- and steel-workers of Great Britain, or the woolen-manufacturers of Belgium, than to see the laboring classes in the United States engaged in these

industries forcing up the price of wages. It operates quite as effectively in their favor as a reduction of the tariff upon their products. The dearer American goods are made, the greater is the chance for foreign competition; and nothing is more illogical for workmen than to demand higher wages on the one hand, and an increased tariff on the other. If they want a higher tariff, consent to a reduction of wages and they have secured their end; but recently, some classes of British workmen, who have clamored most loudly for higher wages, are demanding a tariff upon importations in order to rescue the home market for themselves. This latter demand is the clearest proof of what the advance of wages has brought to them. It has yielded nothing, or rather, loss. True, wages have advanced, but employment has been lost, so where is the gain? Such a pushing up of wages is contrary to all reason, and the effect must end disastrously to the employed. In America, the price of products must be kept down if trade is to be retained, and workmen should be educated to see that their employment depends upon the cheapest production possible. Fairly should they be compensated, and likewise their employers for the use of capital and skill, but it is equally certain that if the greed of either workman or capitalist forces the price of production too high for the consumer, foreign competitors will apply a remedy, speedy and decisive.

Another aspect respecting strikes remains for consideration,—a topic we would gladly omit, for it is an unhealthy feature of unionism. It is the practice of picketing, which consists in posting members of the union at all the approaches to the works struck

against, for the purpose of observing and reporting all workmen going or coming thither; and using such influence as may be in their power to prevent persons from accepting employment in place of the strikers.

Trade-unions declare their policy is merely to represent the case of the union, using argument and persuasion only, and never resorting to violence, intimidation, or coercion. There is no reason for ascribing any other intention to unions; nor can any one deny the legitimacy of this practice. Surely a workman, however earnestly bent he may be in pursuing his accustomed task, will not object to reasoning in regard to the propriety or advantage of withdrawing from work. So long as picketing is confined to reasonable and peaceful methods, no law can, or ought to, be enacted against the practice. For while the employer may be still more crippled by the withdrawal of men whom the pickets persuade to discontinue work, yet if no contract regulates their employment, they have a perfect right to leave at their discretion. Though an employer may be executing a contract which cannot be completed if a strike takes place, yet this is not a thing workmen are in duty bound to consider. So long as they fulfill their agreement with their employer, it is no concern of theirs what obligations he may be under to other parties. They have the right to leave when they please in the absence of any agreement; and if a part strike and persuade the rest to do likewise, the master has no just reason for complaining. Very likely his passions may arise, and, unless a very excellent Christian, he may lose his temper;



but anger is one thing, and accusation another. Though feeling never so provoked, he cannot blame his men unless they violate their engagement with him or incite others to do this. These remarks apply solely to the right of urging all to strike by peaceful methods, without any reference to the question whether workmen are justified in striking on account of the lowness of wages, or any other cause.

Although no fault can be found with such means for inducing laborers to strike, the practical difficulty in the way of sticking to these gentle methods, as proved by experience, is very great. These pickets, be it remembered, are interested parties; having struck, they desire every one else to follow their example; for according to the number abstaining from labor is the probability of a successful issue to the strike. The picket very well knows that if any considerable body of workmen continue at their posts, the strike will be prolonged, and is more likely to end in failure. With such sharp incentives to prevent their fellow-laborers from continuing their occupation, it surprises no one to see them step over the line and use force in accomplishing their end when argument fails. This they have often done. No one, we think, will differ from the Trade-Union Commissioners who has read the evidence given before them, "that during the existence of a strike workmen desirous to accept work are often subjected through the agency of the pickets to molestation, intimidation, and other modes of undue influence, and in effect are prevented from obtaining employment." A most notable illustration has occurred recently. The coal-miners of Pennsylvania waged warfare, not only



against their employers, but against those of their own number who wished to work. Violence was used, and several miners were killed in these lawless attempts to prevent them from pursuing their avocation. The newspapers for a time contained almost daily accounts of the outrages committed. Several have been tried and condemned, and doubtless more will suffer in like manner from the plainest infractions of law.

If the members of a union are in harmony concerning the utility of the strike, pickets are unnecessary. Non-unionists should not be interfered with save by arguments and reasonable methods. But we cannot see the truth of the following remark expressed by the Trade-Unions Commission: "So far as relates to workmen who are not members of the union, picketing implies in principle an interference with the right to dispose of their labor as they see fit, and is therefore without justification." Do they contend that, when one sees another doing a thing believed to be contrary to the interest of both, neither has a right to say anything about the matter? This is a very extreme view to take. Suppose A should advise B how he could make greater profits in his business, would the latter regard such a suggestion as an interference? B is not bound to follow the advice. Daily, hourly, men are advising one another not to do thus or so; we have never heard before that, in so doing, a right is violated. So long as the advised is left to act freely as before, how is he interfered with in the prosecution of his business? Advice is all that pickets are expected to give, and the reason why they give it is, because they deem the interest of those advised to be

the same as their own. Certainly they have a better ground for advising with their fellow-workmen than most persons have who dole out wisdom daily to others. If this be true, the next conclusion of the Commission referred to is equally unsound, namely, picketing, "so far as it relates to the employer, is a violation of his right of free resort to the labor market for the supply of such labor as he requires." For, although the laborer be drawn off from his work, his employer has just as clear a right to go after him as he ever had. The fact of all withdrawing does not affect the freedom of the labor market. If men are taken out and kept out by force, then picketing does interfere with the free disposal of labor, as well as abridge the freedom of the market for employers. It is possible that the Commission meant by the term picketing, not what trade-unions mean by it, but what it actually is, as commonly practiced. If this latter idea is the one intended to be conveyed by the term, we see no flaw in the conclusion they reached.

Messrs. Hughes and Harrison, in their defense of the system, maintained that it has its counterpart in the practices of the masters. They are accused of having associations with rules similar to those of the unions and quite as coercive. They say: "The practice of sending round lists of workmen who are on strike, or who have been discharged, appears to be quite universal. Indeed, in many instances, it seems the sole cause of the association." We admit the truth of the analogy, provided that force, coercion, threats, and the like rude methods are left out of reckoning. We have contended that the practice was justifiable so

long as argument and gentle measures were used ; when harsher ones are employed, by whatever class, they are to be condemned. Freedom to work is a right which no one can justly take away, and if workmen who have struck endeavor to persuade others to follow, it is just as harsh a thing towards their employers as for them to retaliate by persuading other employers not to engage those who, either in the beginning or afterwards, have been induced to strike.

This leads directly to the subject of lockouts, which are supposed to be the correlative of strikes. Mr. Thornton has remarked that "no lockout has ever taken place without being accompanied by a tremendous outcry from the locked-out and their partisans against the tyrannous atrocity, cruelty, and injustice of withholding from the poor the work by which alone they live, and of withholding it equally from the unoffending and offending. Lockouts are most invariably replies to strikes, and, even if entirely unprovoked, they would still be the exact correlatives of strikes, and in so far as the latter are justifiable would be equally justifiable on precisely the same grounds. But a lockout is never initiative, it is always retaliatory ; never the first step in an industrial quarrel, always the answer to an actual or a threatened strike." To us the truth of this reasoning is not so apparent. An iron-master employing a thousand hands suddenly finds one-half of them striking for higher wages. He thinks that, if the other half are permitted to work, they will furnish funds to those not engaged, and so the strike will be prolonged. We admit that so far as the employer has reason to

believe that those who continue to labor will furnish aid and comfort to the idlers, he is justified in taking work away from them. Unionists who complain of this proceeding certainly do so without cause, for it is little less than absurd to suppose that an employer who regrets the attitude assumed by his workmen in striking, will furnish the means to prolong such a state of things, as he would do by furnishing work to any who gave their income to the strikers. And this remark is just as true of all shops whose members use their funds to support those out on a strike. The fact is, those who have struck, and those who are supporting them, are partners in the same affair, and hence there is no injustice in refusing work to them all. This is clear enough. But what shall be said of those who desire to continue for the sake of supporting themselves and their families? Should they be compelled to suffer for the sins of the rest? There is no justification for this vicarious punishment. Doubtless, masters have converted many to unionism by such harsh treatment. One thing appears in this worse than Babylonish confusion, namely: masters ought to procure, if possible, men who are either all unionists or non-unionists, and not attempt to mix oil with water in the same jug. Masters could then deal with their men more intelligently; less suffering would be experienced by the innocent and unoffending. It is not practicable to observe it in those places where unionists greatly outnumber other workmen; but whenever it is possible for non-unionists to unite and form the majority in a shop or factory, this is evidently the best thing for them; though the remark does not



hold as to unionists. For, where they constitute a majority sufficiently large to control a shop and make a strike effectual in stopping work, they harass non-unionists far more than if they were peacefully engaged in some position where they did not fear the action of unions. Lockouts are becoming more frequent as unionism grows in desperation, and non-unionists will find it for their interest to unite and institute some policy of their own, and thus mitigate, if not escape, the terrible effects of lockouts to themselves.

Much has been said of the practice among masters of ostracizing obnoxious unionists, and Messrs. Hughes and Harrison have declared that "persons may well doubt whether there has been anything in the practices of unions shown to be so preposterously one-sided as a combination of masters pledged to refuse employment to workmen who combine. The inherent injustice of the attempt comes out when we suppose the converse case of a unionist, before engaging with an employer, requiring him to sign a document that he would not enter into any association." We cannot see the injustice of a workman making this demand before stipulating for employment whenever he fears the employer might do so and use the power which such a combination would give him to reduce wages, or in any other way injure the laborer's prospects or gains. On the other hand, we do not see the injustice of refusing to hire workmen who are unionists when the employer believes they will annoy him, or strike for higher wages, or in any way injure his business. Neither party is to be blamed for observing precau-



tions before making an agreement. Employers are neither fond of strikers, nor sure of their ability to pay higher wages; and workmen are just as sure they will not work for less; so both parties make all the stipulations necessary to guard against these contingencies. Neither are to be blamed for doing these things, but rather respected and looked upon as exercising a degree of caution which would prevent many a misfortune, were it applied more generally. Nowhere have we observed such coercive measures on the part of masters towards unionists as the latter have practiced upon their fellow-workmen who have not seen the expediency of joining these associations. The instances are quite numerous in which unionists have resorted to severe force to carry their measures. In the neighborhood of Sheffield and Manchester, England, "crime and outrage have been the habitual methods of enforcing the laws of the union." Rattening, which consists in taking away the poor workman's tools, so as to prevent him from earning a living until he has obeyed the orders of the union, is one of the mildest ways of enforcing its demands. One of the witnesses before the Trade-Unions Commission declared that unionists regarded workmen who stand aloof from the society with a feeling akin to that which defenders of their country have towards a citizen who deserts to the invaders for the sake of better pay. Well may the Commissioners say: "Here is manifest, in the testimony of their friends, an utter perversion of all sense of law and duty."

It is true that the Manchester and Sheffield outrages have not been repeated in Great Britain. Had they

been, trade-unions there would have fared far worse than they have. Those terrible occurrences were not sudden outbreaks of thoughtless men, but were instigated and sanctioned by the several unions within the districts in which they were respectively committed. But if not occurring in great manufacturing districts, they have happened elsewhere, although not resulting in so great a destruction to life and property. At Pittsburg, in 1874, a strike broke out lasting several months, and costing the lives of two or three non-unionists who persisted, forsooth, in performing their lawful and regular tasks.

That trade-unions have widened the feeling of enmity between the laboring classes and their employers is clear enough to all. We are not aware that they deny this. It is not regarded as a fault by them, but rather as evidence of a better knowledge of their relations. The workman cannot be persuaded that his interest is identified with that of his employer, but quite the reverse; and so the spirit of antagonism is rising in proportion to the power of the unions to enforce their demands. Everywhere is this separation manifest, and if the breach be not filled, serious results will follow.

Workmen, if they like, can maintain the belief that their own and their masters' interests are different, and still remain friendly. Two merchants are opposed to each other in business, but they are not envious. Granted that workmen, being weaker, are at the mercy, to some extent, of their employers; let them seek to cultivate a spirit of friendship, and at the same time strive to improve their condition. The verdict of the Trade-

Union Commissioners, that workmen look rather to the approval of their unions than to that of their employers, and are less anxious than of yore to stand well with the latter, is sadly true of the laboring classes in nearly all countries, unless we except Switzerland. This was affirmed by Lord Brabazon of the laboring classes in France. The same may be said of them in Belgium, Germany, Denmark, and Spain.

It may be asked: What if this enmity does exist, how is either class seriously affected?

In the first place, by preferring the union for a standard, instead of the master, poorer work is performed, because this institution has ordained rules which have that effect, and purposely so. Thus we have seen how all are brought down to a dead level in respect to quality and amount of work done, to the evident detriment of those workmen possessing greater skill. One who exhibits more than ordinary ability or industry is regarded with jealousy, and in some societies would be fined for doing more than an average day's work, even though he were acknowledged to be a better workman. If the fine were not paid he would be put in the black list and excluded from the society. Such a rule is rigorous and unjust in the extreme. Happily, it does not exist in all unions. Yet some kind of defense can be given for it. It is maintained that men, when permitted to labor freely, will often overtask their energies. This rule, which is to prevent what is termed chasing, had its origin, according to Thomas Conolly, a member of the Society of Operative Stone-Masons, in this way: formerly, more than at present, "there was a practice amongst

the employers of this kind: if one of them met a strong and very skillful man (it is very exceptional in the trade to get those two qualities combined, in other words it is not often that you can find men who are both strong and skillful), desiring to knock as much labor out of his man as he could for his money, he would give him sixpence a day more, and that man would always keep at the top of his speed and drive the other men on, while they were endeavoring to do as much work as they could, because nobody likes to be left behind."

In the second place, the public suffer from the diminution in skill, for they always need the best efforts of man. It is a sad thing for all that unionism is throwing such a blight upon the genius of the working class. But it must be admitted that, as the better workmen themselves are the greatest sufferers, if they agree to these conditions whereby their genius is fettered no one can complain of the exercise of injustice, although all ought to lament the fact.

The Trade-Unions Commission touched upon another point which ought not to be passed over without comment. We will state it substantially in the form presented by them.

It is said that the better workmen are losing, under the influence of trade-unions, the self-reliance and independence by which they used to be distinguished. The desire of the workman to excel, to do the best in his power to give satisfaction to his employer, to improve himself, and if possible to rise in the world, is damped by the thralldom in which he is held to the rules of the union, and by the systematic



disapproval on the part of his fellow-unionists of all efforts to go beyond that average level of exertion which it is the aim of the unions to maintain.

To this it is replied on the part of the unions, their real tendency, considered in a wider and more equitable view, is to raise, not depress, the character of the workman, by making him feel that he is not an insulated agent, subject to oppression, or at all events to accidents over which he can exercise no control, but a member of a strong, united body, capable at once of defending his rights and of insuring him a resource in case of temporary need. Many of the better unions have a code of rules, agreed to between employer and workman, and this practice is held to be a good one as tending to diminish, and usually to extinguish, the occurrence of strikes, and to establish a spirit of co-operation between masters and workmen.

This is the workman's side of the question, nor is the view incorrect. Sufficient evidence can be adduced in proof of its truth. Besides, there is something noble in the willingness to suffer displayed by the better workmen, in order that the condition of the greater number may be improved. The point towards which unions should steer is to create harmony of interest between laborers possessing greater, and those possessing lesser, skill, that both may fare equally well with the employer; but it is too much to expect that such an adjustment of relations can be easily made. It is a work of time, and not till the proper period for accomplishing this purpose has elapsed should unions be judged too harshly for having a defective rule.



Undoubtedly, the antagonism existing between the two classes prevents a settlement of their differences by the peaceful method of arbitration. This is to the injury of both. Enmity and prejudice ought not to blind the eye and prevent the laborer from making the best bargain he can, or from coolly surveying his real position. Again and again has his bitterness led him rashly to strike for higher wages without the slightest reason; when, by putting confidence in employers and stopping to consider what was the real condition of trade, strikes might have been averted. The Pittsburg strike, which lasted so long and ended so disastrously for the workmen, would not have happened if the slightest attention had been given to the real condition of trade. So long as passion instead of reason governs, the repetition of such disgraceful and lamentable scenes may be expected.

Two other features of unionism deserve brief mention. One function of trade-unions is to equalize the supply of labor. This end is easily effected. A secretary of one of the unions thus explains the method: "When the monthly returns, on or about the sixth of each month, come into my hands, I run down the reports to find where men are wanted, and where men are out of employment. I then take the earliest opportunity possible of writing to the secretaries in the towns where men are out of employment, to tell them where men are wanted; and we make a practice of paying the railway or steamboat fare of the men that are out of employment, when we send them to places where men are wanted." This is a most admirable function for the organization to perform, and cannot

be too highly commended, for it is a benefit to both workman and employer.

The other feature of unionism is that it seeks to solve the difficulty of getting work for its members by emigration. This is a sound solution of the question. If the price of labor is below living rates, go to other countries where it is better, or at least where land can be easily obtained upon which workmen and their families can subsist. In Great Britain emigration is becoming more popular, and we rejoice that at last she has found how much improved will be the condition of all by pouring off her surplus population upon the many lands where toilers are few.

Perhaps our readers will think we have taken a very gloomy view of trade-unions and would rather see them die than live. We are not ready to pronounce this conclusion yet. There are great evils connected with them; this we have clearly shown. Some of the practices of these bodies are harsh and painful in the extreme. Many of their rules are founded upon narrow and short-sighted considerations, and are clearly at war with the main principles for which the society was founded. Evidently all workmen who are not members, and they are numerous, are the enemies of trade-unions and receive but little mercy. There is no fraternity between the two classes. All these things, and more which might be added, cannot be denied. On the other hand, it must be remembered that these organizations are comparatively new, and are in a crude state. It is an experiment to get upon a level plane with the capitalist.

Nor do we blink the fact that the necessity exists for some sort of an organization, in some countries at least, to enable workmen to get their just dues. That the rightful claims of labor have been opposed in the years and ages past cannot be denied. The groans of the toiling millions have been long and terrible. Helpless as they have generally been, and powerless to secure better terms from their employers, a remedy has been found in unionism. We do not condemn unionists for the main purpose which has brought them together: they are right in combining; what we find fault with, is the manner in which they proceed. But we remember, also, that the society is young, and it cannot be expected that its rules will be perfect and work smoothly in the beginning. Whenever the rules are found to be defective, they will be amended or repealed. For example, the rule in respect to chasing is falling into disuse, and there is manifest a growing disposition to create such rules as will admit of greater freedom in allowing each man to do his best.

So in regard to picketing, unions are setting their faces against it; and the same may be said of the rule concerning apprentices. As unions grow stronger there is a greater tendency to avoid strikes. This latter is a point of the utmost importance, for strikes are looked upon as the worst evil growing out of unionism. That such is the fact in England has been proved by most elaborate inquiry.\* If not so true of

---

\* Testimony of W. Allan, Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, before the Trade-Unions Commission of Great Britain, in 1867:

Q. Have you found by experience that the advance in wealth and

unions in the United States, it is because they are in a crude state, and have not obtained perfect control over

---

strength of your society has tended to make strikes in the trade more frequent, or the reverse?—Quite the reverse.

Q. Have you found, for instance, taking the last fifteen years, that there have been more trade disputes and more cases of strike and lock-out than there had been in previous periods of fifteen years, or fewer?—Fewer.

Q. Has the executive or central council, or governing body of the society, in your opinion, done anything to prevent disputes from breaking into an actual strike?—The executive council does all it possibly can to prevent any strike, and where they have time or opportunity, generally, as I stated here the other day, they cause a deputation of the workmen to wait on their employers to represent their grievances, and then the council gives advice afterwards. We endeavor at all times to prevent strikes. It is the very last thing we would think of encouraging.

Q. Do you find that the possession of very large funds, and the fact that they belong to a very powerful organization, such as your society is, tends generally to make the members of your society disposed to enter into such a dispute, or the contrary? I am not asking now with regard to the council, but the members.—I should say that the members generally are decidedly opposed to strikes, and that the fact of our having a large accumulated fund tends to encourage that feeling amongst them. They wish to conserve what they have got: as I have heard it put here, the man who has not got a shilling in his pocket has not much to be afraid of, but with a large fund such as we possess, we are led to be exceedingly careful not to expend it wastefully, and we believe that all strikes are a complete waste of money, not only in relation to the workmen, but also to the employers.

Q. Have you found by experience that your society has done anything to promote the same feeling or the same practice in other trade societies?—Many of the societies (the Amalgamated Carpenters' and others I could mention) have taken in fact our constitution and our mode of management as their guide.

Q. Has your society in recent times ever interfered in trade questions with a view of bringing about a settlement?—Yes.

Q. Has it ever interfered to put a stop to, or dissuade, or discour-

their members. As they grow in intelligence, and learn how clearly related they are to the capitalist, they will become allies in the great task of production. But time must be given these organizations to fulfill their mission. Painful and costly are many of their acts and methods, nor do we hope for immediate improvement. Yet every impolitic and unjust measure will eventually have an end, as surely as the sun dispels the darkness of night.

---

tenance, a threatened strike or an actual strike?—Decidedly; we have recommended that no strike should take place, at least in twenty cases in as many months.



## VI.

CO-OPERATION.

---

UNIONISM is not the only method for increasing wages. Co-operation is another, and by no means an insignificant one. Though less noisy than unionists, co-operators have much to show from their experiments. Until now, however successful unionism has been, co-operation has accomplished far more.

Fewer of these organizations exist in the United States than in European countries; not because they are less suited to our soil, but for the reason that, labor being more highly paid, there is less necessity for creating them. England, France, and Germany, have each been successful in propagating three forms of co-operation: the first, societies of distribution; the second, those of production; while the success of Germany has consisted in instituting societies of credit whose functions are to open accounts of credit with their members and furnish them loans. A short description of each kind is all that need be given in this place.

Distributive co-operation may be said to have originated in England a generation before the birth of the Rochdale Pioneers, which was organized about thirty years ago. This is the oldest co-operative society ex-

isting in Great Britain, and was the first well considered and successful effort. Its history has been told in a most attractive way by Mr. Thornton in his work "On Labor." The rise of this society was like the growth of a mustard-seed. In the beginning, twenty-eight flannel-weavers, disgusted with the poor quality and outrageous price of the provisions they were in the habit of buying, subscribed two and three pence a week towards making up a sum of twenty-eight pounds, which they spent in purchasing, at wholesale prices, in Manchester, flour, sugar, butter and oatmeal. From this common stock, each took what he wanted at the current prices, paying in cash; and when the whole amount had been sold, they were surprised to find that so much had been made by the operation. They repeated the experiment. They purchased in larger quantities and added to their subscribers. The embryo association was laughed at in the beginning, but it continued to grow, and after a short time it was found that a room was necessary to hold the goods purchased. A small one was hired, and it was arranged that one of their number should act as salesman for a few hours during two evenings in the week. In 1845, the second year of the society, the number of subscribers had increased from twenty-eight to seventy-four, and the capital was one hundred and eighty-one pounds, upon which a net benefit of thirty-two pounds had accrued. The two following years they divided eighty pounds and seventy-seven pounds; and they have gone on increasing at a wonderful rate ever since. In 1847, linen and woollen drapery was added to the original grocery and chandlery business;

in 1850, a butcher's shop was grafted on; shortly after, a slaughter-house; in 1852, shoemaking and tailoring were begun. A single glance at the profits tells the story of progress. We have not space for all the figures; we will simply show what they were at the end of each period of five years. The society was started in 1844, and the net profits run as follows:

1845.....	£22	1850.....	£880
1846.....	80	1855.....	3,106
1847.....	77	1860.....	15,906
1848.....	117	1865.....	25,156
1849.....	561	1867.....	41,619

The causes of their success are very clearly seen. They bought at wholesale, and always paid in cash, thus getting the largest discounts. They never sold on credit, and consequently had no bad debts. Having a large number of shareholders, they were assured of plenty of customers, and were under no necessity of spending a penny to make themselves known in order to obtain trade. The expenses of management were small, not exceeding two per cent. of the business done. For attracting outsiders, their equitable distribution of profits was a device far more efficacious than a showy front or advertising.

When any one makes a purchase, he receives a tin ticket, whether a member of the association or not, denoting the sum he has paid. At the end of every quarter, when profits are declared, there is a deduction of five per cent. per annum for interest on the capital, another deduction of two and one-half per cent. as an education fund is taken out, and the balance is divided among the holders of the tickets.

There are some very decided benefits arising from this form of co-operation. First, one's money goes farther than anywhere else ; secondly, the stores give the best possible security to the purchaser that what he buys will be of the best quality, since it is the same as the owners of the concern purchase for themselves. Upon these points Mr. Holyoake\* has justly said : "The whole atmosphere of a store is honest. In that market there is no distrust and no deception—no adulteration and no second prices. Buyer and seller meet as friends. There is no overreaching on the one side, and no suspicion on the other."

Besides supplanting dearer and poorer shops, co-operative stores stimulate to self-amendment and promote prudence. The poorer class, considering the means they have, are not infrequently quite as wasteful and extravagant as others ; but these societies have a most beneficial effect in the way of elevating all concerned, and making them prudent and more self-reliant men.†

---

\* "Self-Help," pp. 38-9. He also says: "They have no interest in chicanery. Their sole duty is to give fair measure, full weight, and pure quality, to men who never knew before what it was to have a wholesome meal, whose shoes let in water a month too soon, whose waistcoat shone with devil's dust, and whose wives wore calico that would not wash. These men now buy in the market like millionaires, and, as far as pureness of food goes, live like lords. They make their own shoes, sew their own garments, and grind their own corn. They buy the purest sugar and the best tea, and grind their own coffee. They slaughter their own cattle, and the finest beasts of the land waddle down the streets of Rochdale, for the consumption of flannel-weavers and cobblers."

† An article by Professor Fawcett upon "The Position and Prospects



The progress made by these societies, according to the "Sixth Report of the Annual Co-operative Congress," held in 1874, is most satisfactory. Returns to the Register showed that seven hundred and forty-eight retail stores were in operation in England and Wales, numbering three hundred thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight members, and having a share capital of \$13,928,885. This does not include all, for sixty-seven societies made no returns, while no statistics are given for Scotland. Besides, there are a large number of wholesale stores having a million dollars capital, and doing a yearly business of \$8,184,765, while the business of similar associations in Scotland amounted to \$1,904,365 more. To these societies should be added an industrial bank and a co-operative insurance company.

Passing from distributive to productive co-operation, we shall consider what has been done on French soil, although great progress has attended English enterprises of this character. During the revolutionary excitement of 1848 the constituent assembly of France voted three million francs to these societies, which was divided among fifty-six of them. This proved anything but a blessing, for not long after receiving this subvention, forty-two associations collapsed. Among those founded at that time was the Association Remquet, so called after the name of its founder. Pre-

---

of Co-operation," in the February number of the *Fortnightly Review*, 1874, is worth reading in this connection. Also one by Thomas Hughes upon "The Working Classes of Europe," in the *International Review*, March, 1874.



vious to this he had been employed in a printing establishment, which was obliged to suspend. Remquet thereupon proposed to his fellow-workmen to unite their labors and continue business on their own account. Fifteen consented, and, obtaining a loan of eighty thousand francs from the state to serve as capital, they formed a society with Remquet at its head, the regulations fixing the rate of wages for all kinds of work, and providing for the gradual formation of a working capital by reserving one-fourth part of every man's wages. This capital was to pay no dividends nor interest during the ten years for which the society was intended to last, but at the end of that term was to be divided among all the associates in the ratio of their contributions, that is to say, in the exact proportion of the work each had done. When ten years had expired, the net capital remaining after repayment of the government loan amounted to one hundred and fifty-five thousand francs, more than ten thousand francs for each member. The lowest sum received by any one was seven thousand francs; the highest eighteen thousand.

Another society formed at this period was made up of masons, whose success is worth mentioning. Seventeen united in the beginning, having a capital of three hundred and sixty-two francs, or seventy-two dollars and forty cents. In 1867 the membership had increased to eighty-four,—two being managers, one an assistant-manager; of the remaining eighty-one, two-thirds labor with the hod and trowel, and the rest are superintendents and distributors of work, or simply holders of capital. The society employs from two hun-

dred to three hundred workmen, called auxiliaries, but they have no share in the profits. They were permitted to do so for a time, provided they would share any loss accruing, but it was found necessary to discontinue the system, owing to the impossibility of reconciling them to a participation in losses. The number of workmen employed in 1867 was increased, for the association undertook the construction of a railway station in Paris costing two million francs. The power to execute such a contract stamps the character of the society. According to Villiaum , previously to becoming associated these masons were poorly clad in vest and blouse, because they never had sixty francs with which to purchase a frock-coat, but now most of them are as well dressed as the bourgeois, and often in better taste.

Mr. Thornton says the most ancient co-operative society in existence is that of the jewelers, formed in Paris, in 1831, by eight workmen, with a capital of no more than two hundred francs. A government loan of twenty-four thousand francs enabled them, in 1849, to extend their business, which, in 1858, amounted to one hundred and forty thousand francs.

In 1867 there were thirty-nine co-operative associations engaged in production in Paris, and a very large number in the provinces. Three great societies flourish in Lyons,—one the weavers, numbering eighteen hundred members; while another, the ribbon-manufacturers, counts a membership of twelve hundred, and possesses a capital of one million two hundred thousand francs. The society having the most pathetic history is that of the piano-manufacturers,

founded at Paris, in 1849, by fourteen workmen, having a capital of two hundred and twenty-nine francs fifty centimes (forty-five dollars and ninety cents). It never received any aid from the state, but struggled on through many difficulties, and now possesses a capital of two hundred thousand francs, and is doing an annual business of equal amount.

More instances might be added respecting the successful working of these institutions, but enough have been given to prove the practicability of co-operation in production as well as in distribution.

In 1872 fifty productive associations were in operation in the United Kingdom of Great Britain. So profitable have these become, and so many trials have they successfully endured, they are no longer regarded as experiments.

The most prosperous co-operative productive association in the United States is an iron-foundry established at Troy, New York. It was begun in May, 1866, with a capital of fifteen thousand dollars. A charter was procured fixing two thousand as the number of shares, and their value at one hundred dollars each. No member could have more than fifty shares, nor less than one. Each member was entitled to a vote irrespective of the number of shares held. Thirty-two men united in forming the association, but this number has been increasing every year. A dividend of ten per cent. on the stock was declared the first year, and about thirty per cent. more was paid on labor. The second year the dividends on stock and labor reached eighty-nine per cent., and they have been very large ever since.

Great importance is attached to the employment only of a limited number of men. The fewer the number, the greater are the chances of success. Besides, by limiting the number of stockholders, constant work at regular wages is assured. In busy seasons additional help can be employed.

The profits of the establishment have not been paid out to the members; additional stock has been issued instead, and the money retained to enlarge the business. When a member's stock has accumulated until owning more than fifty shares as allowed by law, the surplus has been bought in and issued to new members. In this way the increased capital has given employment to more men, and the business has been safely and naturally enlarged.

Excellent discipline, also, is enforced. Rules are made to prevent refusal to perform any work demanded by the foreman, or an evasion of it, as well as to guard against drunkenness, waste, and insubordination. A stockholder can be dismissed at any moment, whatever may be the number of shares owned by him, and there are no means of redress. The consequence of such strict rules is that every man is put on his good behavior.

For the last two years the business in which the association is engaged has been very dull; nevertheless, it has paid expenses and furnished work during eleven months of the year to its members. This, surely, is a good showing, considering the condition of business, since many iron-foundries are not running more than eight or nine months in the year. At present, about one hundred men are employed, their wages



averaging four dollars per day. Sixty are stockholders, *every one* of this number having acquired considerable property since the creation of the organization.

The capital stock has been increased from time to time until the actual amount has rolled up to one hundred thousand dollars. There are two foundries, each having a capacity to employ thirty men, besides store-houses, mounting shops, and other buildings and property. No one can question the success of this experiment, or have any fears concerning its future.

The third form of co-operation relates to the establishment of co-operative banks, the purpose of which is to furnish means to those who are desirous of producing on their own account. As this number constitute a very large class in Germany, the furnishing of capital to them is a thing of far greater importance than in any other country. Not that concentration of the leading branches of industry in a few hands is desirable. Great industrial establishments have benefited mankind by multiplying and cheapening production, but they have crushed individual producers and compelled them to go into shops and factories like other workmen. In Germany, the noblest energies have been employed to keep this class alive, the principal difficulty being to furnish them with capital. Co-operative banks were founded to effect this purpose; their success no one will question.

These institutions have been so often described as to render it quite unnecessary to lay the plan before our readers. Mr. Villard read a paper before the American Social Science Association in 1869 describing their origin and working, while an article by



Thomas Hughes, entitled, "The Working Classes of Europe," published in the *International Review*, March, 1874, carries authentic information concerning them down to a recent date. The report furnished by Mr. Morrier to the British government in 1867 enters into an elaborate investigation of the origin and progress of these institutions, and is accompanied with a translation of the law authorizing their creation. From these sources complete information can be obtained concerning co-operative banks whenever the time shall come for creating them in the United States.

The chief objection to co-operation as usually carried on is, that capital is too completely divorced from labor. Any scheme of production seeking to get on without a fair amount of capital to pay for the raw product and other things is defective. Could this be obtained according to the requirements of business, co-operation would be able to make far more headway than hitherto. This difficulty to a great extent has been surmounted in Germany, thus saving a great body of producers from being swallowed by overgrown industrial concerns. The state and the individual are both better off by retaining a large number of independent producers.

Co-operation does not solve perfectly the future of the laboring classes; but it certainly has accomplished much and promises more. To co-operation, therefore, we can confidently look as a fitting, though not the only, answer to the great question of the age.

## VII.

INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIPS.

---

As we have seen, the chief objection to co-operative organizations is the isolation of capital from labor. In the form of effort now to be considered, these two potent agencies of production are brought into alliance. Consequently, it is the more natural method, though it has proved thus far not very successful.

An industrial partnership is created by uniting the employer with his men who are paid wages, sometimes at the market rate, in some cases less, and then, after deducting a sum for the use of capital, the remainder of the profits, if any there be, is divided among all in various proportions determined by agreement. The longest-~~tried~~ experiment in Great Britain was that of the Methley collieries, owned by Henry Briggs, Son & Co. The business of the proprietors was undertaken in 1852. For the next twelve years their relations with their men were most unsatisfactory, and strikes were constantly occurring. In 1865, they launched their experiment of an industrial partnership. The business of the firm was transferred to a joint-stock company, the owners retaining two-thirds of the shares, and offering the other third to the public, and especially inviting their employees to become share-

holders. At the same time they arranged "that whenever the divisible profits accruing from the business, after a fair and usual reservation for redemption of capital and other legitimate allowances, exceeded ten per cent. on the capital embarked, all those employed by the company as managers, agents, or work-people, should receive one-half of such excess profit as a bonus, to be distributed among them as a percentage on their respective earnings during the year in which such profit should have accrued."

They made no claim to disinterestedness; they adopted the system as one of convenience and speculation. Their profits had never exceeded ten per cent., and these they were sure of receiving before there was any division to the employees.

Until the close of 1874, a period of nearly ten years, the experiment was eminently successful. The trial began July 1, 1865. "At the end of the first twelve-month the total of profits was found to be fourteen per cent., of which the shareholders took twelve and the work-people two per cent. In the second year the total was sixteen per cent., the shareholders getting thirteen per cent. and the work-people three. In the third year the corresponding figures were seventeen and three and a half." So the concern went on gathering strength and realizing fully the expectations of all parties interested, besides some unlooked-for advantages. During the year 1875 a cloud overshadowed the fair prospect. Profits having greatly declined, it was found necessary to reduce wages. The justice, or rather necessity of doing this, the workmen could not see. For several weeks efforts

were made to adjust the difficulty, but no proposition looking towards a reduction of wages would the workmen consider. Finally the partnership was dissolved, to the mortification of the Messrs. Briggs, who, deeming their experiment thoroughly tested, had gone so far as to recommend an adoption of the system to all employers of labor.

So long as the price of wages kept up, all went well with the Methley collieries; when a reduction became necessary, the system broke down. Many had long felt the crucial test was to order a reduction, and never until such a time came, and the concern passed smoothly over it, could the system be thought fairly tried. The Messrs. Briggs had reason for supposing the evil days with their workmen were passed, and their failure, after so long a trial, is the more to be regretted, because it will deter others from undertaking kindred experiments.

Another plan of industrial partnership worthy of mention was sketched by Mr. Abram E. Hewitt in his testimony before the Trade-Unions Commission. He proposed the enactment of a law whereby the owner of any manufactory or other concern might issue participation certificates, or, to use his own words: "I may make a certificate of a hundred dollars, and say to my workmen, 'I will sell you that for one hundred dollars; you shall pay for it in money, or I will take it out of your wages, and that certificate shall entitle you to your *pro rata* share of the profits, which shall be made out by an accountant under inspection.'" Such a plan would be objectionable in some kinds of business, but, of course, any law authorizing this



would not be mandatory, but permissive. The workman would have his share of the profits, the proportion being fixed by agreement. The supposed advantages of this plan were, workmen would know they were sharing in the profits, and also the exact condition of business,—when they might fairly demand an increase of wages, and when not. On the other hand, the owner would retain the right to redeem these certificates if workmen became drunkards, unruly, or disagreeable, upon payment of the sum for which they were sold. According to this scheme, workmen acquire no ownership in the property and no right to control it. That is still vested in the owner, whose duty it is to manage and conserve the capital. Yet workmen acquire an interest in the concern which not only pays them some profit, but induces them to save, and to determine more perfectly what wages they ought to receive. This scheme, Mr. Hewitt affirmed, was receiving great attention in the United States, and is being successfully tried by Mr. Lawson, at Carlisle, Scotland.

The principle of admitting workmen to participate in the profits of their employers has been adopted by M. Cini, the owner of an extensive paper-mill in Tuscany, Italy. In 1869 ordinary hands were paid fixed rates, from seven to ten francs (one dollar and twenty cents to two dollars) per week, and whenever the production of paper exceeded a certain quantity, they received an increase of wages in proportion to the excess. The fixed wages of foremen, superintendents, etc., were low, being only nine dollars a month, but they also received a share of the profits, so they be-

came directly interested in the prosperity of the factory. In this way they gained from twenty to thirty dollars monthly, while the weekly wages of ordinary hands were increased from one dollar and eighty cents to two dollars and forty cents per week.

Nowhere as on French soil has the plan of industrial partnership been so long and so favorably tried. One of the oldest experiments is Leclaire's, cited by Mill in the second volume of his "Principles of Political Economy." M. Leclaire was a house-painter, employing about two hundred workmen, whom he paid by giving fixed wages and salaries. In 1840 he determined to give his workmen a share in the profits of his establishment. He assigned to himself, besides interest for his capital, a fixed allowance for his labor and responsibility as manager; and, at the end of the year, the surplus profits were divided among them all, himself included, in proportion to their salaries. Leclaire, however, did not admit all, but less than half the workmen, to participate in the profits. All, though, received full market wages, so that none had any cause to complain. In 1864 the business was reorganized; Messrs. Leclaire and Defournaux uniting with fifty-nine associate, and between one hundred and two hundred non-associate, workmen. A benefit society of the workmen, which had accumulated one hundred thousand francs, entered as a partner of the new concern, in which each of the proprietors had invested an equal amount. The annual profits are divided in the following manner: fifty per cent. to Leclaire and Defournaux, who severally receive in addition a salary of six thousand francs for managing the business of the

establishment. The remaining fifty per cent. is assigned to clerks and workmen, two-fifths going to the benefit society and three-fifths among the clerks and workmen who have rendered themselves worthy of recompense.

By good authority it is said the conduct of the workmen is exemplary, that the best relations subsist between them and the proprietors, and that the participation of the workmen in the profits of the establishment has exercised considerable influence both upon the rapidity and quality of the work executed.

Since France is pre-eminently the home of social experiments, one would expect to find that the vexed relations between labor and capital had been the subject of more inquiry there than anywhere else. And so they have. As the outcome of speculation and trial, the union of capital and labor in some form of industrial partnership is regarded as the best solution of the grave problem yet suggested. Not that the difficulties inherent in the plan are in the least overlooked. How profits shall be divided between capital and labor, how the latter, having nothing to lose, can in any real sense become a sharer in losses, what proportion of wages shall be paid *pro rata* to the working classes to enable them to live before dividing the profits, if there be any to divide,—these questions are just as profoundly grasped in France as in any other country. Yet they have been answered, and in a way so practical that we will record the answers.

Replying to the third question first, it is proposed that a *minimum* rate of wages, fixed by a vote of the society, be paid weekly, and the dividend on profits

be declared quarterly, half-yearly, or annually, as may be found convenient. It is contended that this *minimum* rate of wages need not be regulated by the market price of labor; the arrangement being provisional, wages may often be lower than the market price without working injustice. The rate should be voted twice a year, the value of labor being more variable than that of capital.

Secondly. If, at the end of the quarter or term fixed, the undertaking has yielded no profits, or has lost, the workmen receiving only a *minimum* rate of wages will lose the difference between the sum received and what they might have earned elsewhere, and the capitalist will also lose in like manner upon his capital.

Thirdly. In order to arrive at a division of profits, the amount of capital employed should be compared with the sum of wages paid. If the capital, for example, is sixty thousand francs, and the amount of wages expended forty thousand francs, three-fifths of the net profits realized should go to the capitalist, and two-fifths to supplement the wages of the workmen.

It is easy to expose flaws in this scheme, as Mr. Fane has done; nevertheless, it is suggestive to capitalists as to what they may do in solving the problem confronting them. Many instances with modifications to make the plan fit the case could be given, showing how the idea is blooming and ripening into the fairest fruit. In the iron-foundry of M. Godin-Lemaire, at Guise, employing nine hundred men; in the factory of Messrs. Dollfus, Meig & Co., at Mulhouse and



Dornach; in those of Charles Kestner, near Gironmagny, Messrs. Schlumberger & Co., at Guebwiller, and Messrs. Bourcart & Co., in the same town; the shoe-manufactory of M. Savart, at Paris; in Messrs. Steinheil, Dieterlen & Co.'s factory, at Rothau; and in the establishments of the Paris and Orleans Railway Company\* and of the Middle Railway,—in all these cases has the industrial partnership proved a splendid success.

An industrial partnership was founded by the brothers Godin, in Belgium, nearly half a century ago, containing several very unique and remarkable features. The brothers sought to make every workman do his best by introducing the principle of responsibility. When the last of the brothers died, in 1867, a Belgian journal gave some account of the working of the factory. Not only was the workman rewarded according to the quantity and quality of his work, but inattention and negligence were punished. He was recompensed according to the application and perfection introduced into the manufacture of the paper, which was the business of the establishment, confounding the interest of man and master, and yet making each one independent in his own sphere.

In this manufactory, which is a small world, who surveys the work of the workman, to see that his part is properly executed? The workman himself. All imperfect manipulation is discovered by the succeeding workman, who is obliged to report defects to the

---

\* This Company divided eight million francs among its employees between 1844 and 1871.

proper officer. Were this a duty solely, he might be often tempted to neglect it; but as he is interested pecuniarily in the product, self-interest impels him to insure the execution of the work in the best manner. Nevertheless, this surveillance seemed insufficient to the Godins. They introduced a mute overseer, incorruptible and novel, that followed the product through all the stages of manufacture from the time the raw material was received until the paper was finished, noting the name of the operators and the quality of their work. Yet even this did not suffice. There must be a supreme judge, a court of appeal, so merciless and clear-sighted that nothing can escape his lynx eye. This is the purchaser of the product manufactured. Suppose the operation has been imperfectly performed through the negligence or connivance of the workman. The purchaser, discovering the fault, makes complaint to the proprietor, who immediately orders a search to find out where the mistake has been committed. This search is so thorough, and the manufacture is carried on in such a way, that the slightest fault may be detected and the negligent or guilty person discovered. Thus, says the Belgian journal, everything is connected by means so simple in principle, though complicated in application, that an investigation can be made incredibly soon, no fault can escape, and responsibility will be brought home to its author. The goods of the establishment have attained a wide reputation for excellence, and, though both of the founders are dead, it is highly prosperous, and all the workmen are thriving and content.

In the report of Mr. Gould to the British govern-

ment on the condition of the industrial classes in Switzerland, three years since, he remarks that "the only really effectual solution of the greatest question of the period would seem to be in the removal of the existing obstacles to the direct participation of the working-men in the profits of their employers." After suggesting a practical plan\* for effecting this end, he relates the example of a watchmaking establishment at La Chaux de Fonds, in the canton of Neuchâtel, managed most successfully according to the method described. The men, numbering thirty-five, are admitted on probation, and are dismissed for want of ability or the slightest irregularity of conduct. After five years all, including the clerks, are admitted to

---

\* The following is the plan suggested by Mr. Gould :

" The entire management of affairs and control over the men to be rested as heretofore in the masters; their books to remain closed to inspection on the part of the men, except on preconcerted and special occasions, should such a proceeding be unavoidable (notwithstanding the official declaration of profits which has to be annually made in many countries); such inspection to be made only by one or more delegates, chosen by the men and approved of by the masters, and moreover sworn to secrecy; the men to bind themselves under penalties to observe the conditions on which they are engaged; all matters of pecuniary interest in dispute between masters and men to be submitted to arbitration, such arbitration to be considered final; the men as heretofore to receive fixed wages according to a reasonable scale, the probable addition thereto arising from their share in the net profits being duly taken into consideration; the men to be likewise entitled to a certain fixed percentage of the net profits, if any, each individual's share thereof being determined by the amount of wages he receives; lastly, the term net profits to be understood to mean the profits arising from the transactions engaged in after the payment of all expenses as well as losses, and of a fixed interest on the capital employed, proportionate to the risk incurred."

share, proportionate to the amount of their respective wages, in the net profits of the business. At Basel, and one or two other places, are establishments conducted in a similar way.

The last experiment of the kind to be noted was undertaken by Messrs. Brewster & Co., of New York, the famous carriage-manufacturers. It was in October, 1869, that the proposal was made to their men, at a time when peace reigned in their shop and business was prosperous. They proposed to all persons in their employ, excepting those who had a direct interest in their business, a share of the annual profits, in addition to the regular wages, which were to be as high as those paid by similar establishments. The amount of profit to be divided among the employees was one-tenth of the whole, making no deductions for interest on capital or for services of the partners. The division was to be annual; the business for each year being wholly disconnected from any other. This offer was accepted by the men, and on the first of January, 1870, the agreement went into operation. For nearly two years and a half the partnership continued to flourish and fulfill the expectations of all concerned. At the end of the first six months a dividend was declared and paid, in order to make the fiscal year of the partnership begin on the first of July; and a year from that date a second dividend was ordered, the two amounting to eleven thousand five hundred dollars. The men worked more contentedly, and the most harmonious relations subsisted between them and their employers. All were gainers, socially and financially. During the year



1872 the workmen were carried away by the eight-hour movement, and demanded of their employers a reduction of the working hours per day to eight. They had a right to do this themselves under the constitution creating the partnership, but, singularly enough, they demanded this as a concession direct from their employers, who justly refused to comply. Had the leader of the workmen been among them when the agitation was at its height, probably they never would have acted so foolishly. Contrary to their own interests, four-fifths of them struck and remained idle two weeks, and then began work without any concession on the part of their employers. Such conduct discouraged the proprietors, and they broke up the partnership, having reserved this right in the original agreement, whereby the men lost a dividend of eleven thousand dollars nearly due, besides nine thousand dollars wages occasioned by the strike.

Notwithstanding the unfavorable issue of this experiment, the proprietors have faith yet in the plan modified in some particulars. It is to be preferred to co-operation, because capital and greater skill in management are united with labor. Such a mode of rewarding labor is just and encouraging. Men like profits better than salaries. We suspect this is the outcropping of the speculative or gambling spirit which every person displays in some degree. It is only fair, though, since workmen add their full share to the increase of capital, that the division of such increase be equitable. It is the best stimulus to workmen, and the fairest mode of conducting business

whenever possible. The whale-fisheries have always been conducted on this principle. It is worthy of more attention than it has received, for it reveals the true relationship that should exist between employers and employed. Being partners in production, so ought they to be in its rewards.

## VIII.

EDUCATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

---

EDUCATION is a very old remedy for healing the differences between capital and labor. Were the disease less violent, this remedy perhaps would be effective; but a very superficial diagnosis of the case reveals the necessity of applying swifter relief. Water will have no effect in restoring a drowning person to life; something stronger must be given. A remedy is wanted, producing speedy effect. Both capital and labor are impatient, and desire an instant settlement. To compel attendance at school is well enough; in the mean time a generation must pass away before educated workmen are seen in the factory or workshop. If possible, their education should begin at once, whether young or old, whether at work or idle. That the laboring classes may learn better than to strike when the act is opposed by honesty and self-interest, is the need of the hour. Educate the children, of course; but can nothing be done in the way of enlightening the older classes concerning their true interests?

To devise a system of education for all the sons of toil is not so difficult as to make them see the advantages of procuring it. Compulsory attendance at

school is opposed strongly by those having children who need education most. Evidently, such parents set a higher value upon wages than upon education; or, if regarding education somewhat favorably, a present gain is preferred to a future one. Besides, the educational benefit accrues to the child, and not to the parent: and so we find thousands not appreciating the benefits of education, either for themselves or for their children; parents who make no effort to become informed themselves, and prevent light from streaming into the minds of their own offspring. For this reason nearly all the educational energy of this country has been spent in training children and perfecting the common-school system, while the majority of the adult working-men and women are left to their own devices.

If education will melt down the antagonism between the two classes, why should older workmen be neglected? And if it be worthless, why educate any one? Surely the same arguments apply with equal force to the education of all. Of course, it is not practicable for every one to go to the existing schools, as parents must work in order to gain a livelihood; but this fact does not render their education any the less desirable.

Doubtless, education sometimes fails to yield the fruit expected. The education received by many in the schools unfits them for the occupation they ought to follow. The true end of education should be to enable its possessor to act perfectly his part in life; but what is the popular conception of this? It is to follow some profession, or seek political fame; in short, to make a great noise in the world. If this be



the true end, only a few can ever succeed, for places and opportunities are not numerous enough for all. This is not the aim of education, however. The true idea is to enable a person to do the very best possible with his abilities and opportunities. His life is the most successful who accomplishes most with the resources and circumstances at his command. Judged by the true standard, some humble coal-miner who has rarely seen daylight may have lived a life just as splendid as earth's greatest hero. He may have done the very best possible for himself, and who can do more?

That this must be held up as the true standard of success, is clear from the fact that it is the only standard rendering success possible for every being. To make the attainment of some high office in government, or achievement in art, science, or literature, the sole test of success, is to shut out the greater portion of mankind from competition, because they must pursue humbler callings in order to live. In the race for success, the first condition must be that all have the opportunity to enter the lists. To prevent the greater portion of mankind from competing, and then accuse them of failing, is a judgment as incorrect as it is pitiless.

That education often fails to convey the true idea concerning one's future in life, none can deny. Not a year rolls around without persons going forth from the higher schools of the land with very erroneous notions as to what they should do. Youthful aspirations are often wrongly stimulated. Their thoughts and energies too often are turned into a wrong chan-

nel. They learn to dream of the impossible, and are disappointed and unhappy when they see their beautiful castles vanish. Not too soon can this false method of education be corrected. Were it certain that one of a hundred boys could win the presidential chair by persisting in the effort, we do not believe it is worth while for all to try. Ninety-nine lives are too many to throw away that one may succeed. Every person should live a successful life. But the schools in many cases prevent this. They do not paint the dignity of labor in bright colors, and so, instead of learning a trade and bending down to hard begriming tasks, although sure to rise quickly, because of a superior outfit, students go forth and seek clerkships, prepare for college, and become lawyers, physicians, and the like. Now and then one succeeds in some learned pursuit, but thousands fail. We do not propose to say a word against higher education; one thing, however, is certain: many would have succeeded in what are termed the lower pursuits who have miserably failed in the higher. We do not mean to cool the zeal of those who are striving to gain a liberal education and enter the learned professions, provided they be quite sure of becoming better lawyers, physicians, artists, scientists, than anything else. And the fact that some who engage in learned pursuits fail is not conclusive in respect to all, for, perhaps, either from innate laziness or other defect the unsuccessful ones would have been not less so in anything. But it is none the less true that, in consequence of the education received by our youth, stimulated in many cases by bad advice, they are led away from the pursuits in

which they are most likely to succeed. Thousands acquire a liberal education who might have spent their energies, time, and money to better advantage. Their education was not by any means useless to them, but they might have gained more by pursuing a different course.

Education ought to lead its possessor to see what is best for himself considering all his capacities and surroundings, and to make him contented with doing the most promising task, whatever it be. Instead of having this effect, too often it stimulates ambition without developing the mind and correcting the judgment. It seems to delude its possessor in respect to his powers, and he comes to think success is probable in almost anything he may undertake. Education does not lead him to place a true estimate upon his talents and surroundings. Hence the multitude of failures which are constantly happening. What more conclusive evidence does one want in respect to the defectiveness of education?

In tracing the causes of the prosperity of Switzerland, Mr. Gould declares that national education takes precedence of every other. "The benefits conferred on the population by a sound elementary education, such as befits the particular sphere in which they are individually destined to move in after-life, cannot assuredly be overrated. Nevertheless it becomes less clear how far its positive advantages out-balance the possible disadvantages, if it be carried beyond a certain point extremely difficult to define." The desire to carry education in schools too far is manifesting itself among a class of politicians and others in that

country. Passing over the question of expense to the families in doing this, their need of their children's services, we come to the objection previously raised, and which is thus stated by Mr. Gould: "As a sound elementary education of the working classes tends not only to develop their mental faculties, but also to raise them above mere sensual enjoyments, and is of undoubted advantage to them in every-day transactions of life, so a higher-classed education is just as likely to unsettle their minds, and to render them discontented with the position in which they find themselves."

In the canton of Zurich a proposed law for extending the period of compulsory attendance at school was thrown out by an overwhelming majority when referred finally to popular vote. This decision, which was unexpected, proves that the people of Zurich at least view their interest in a different light from their leaders.

The system of education needed is one which will be of practical benefit to its possessor. What is learned, but disused, will soon be forgotten. Learning which unfits the possessor for any save a literary or scientific calling, it were better never to have acquired, unless he can follow such a pursuit successfully. Thousands have been unfitted to act well their part in the drama of life on account of their education; who can deny this?

What, then, is wanting in the education generally given to children? It ought to be supplemented with instruction having special reference to the occupation they are going to follow. Of course, this does not



apply to those who intend pursuing an extended course of instruction. It relates to the great body of students having no such end in view, and who, at an early age, are obliged to earn a living. It does not include even the education of the student as a citizen of the state, nor by any means his own complete development. The conception of him is principally that of an industrial person who is fitting himself to do skillful work and earn a satisfactory livelihood. It would be a shallow and most imperfect view of one's nature to maintain that an industrial education is all that is needed by any class of persons, in addition to the general instruction furnished by most of the States in the American Union. But we do insist upon furnishing such an education first, to be extended afterwards if circumstances will admit. No kind of education, however, ought to be regarded as of more importance than a mental outfit whereby persons can earn their daily bread and provide for their families.

That education will enable its possessor to make a living more easily none can deny. In 1870, the educational bureau in Washington issued a circular asking employers and others who knew, what effect, if any, education wrought upon the price of labor; and the general reply was, ordinary common-school education added twenty to fifty per cent. in the income of laborers. In other language, when a parent sends his boy through a common school he is worth one-fifth to one-half more to himself than he would be without such an education. If, for example, the ignorant tailor can make one thousand dollars per annum, he

would earn two hundred to five hundred dollars a year in addition provided he was properly educated. This increase, if carefully saved, would be the foundation for an early fortune. Not long since we visited the studio of one of the most celebrated sculptors in Florence. In the first room were men shaping rough blocks of marble, leaving them before any well-defined figure appeared. These men received small pay, for the skill they displayed was ordinary. The blocks were taken from this into an adjoining room, where much greater skill was displayed in fashioning them. Here beautiful forms were wrought in the marble under the skillful manipulation of the workmen. They were much better paid than the workers previously mentioned. Finally, the blocks passed under the eye of the master, who, with his chisel, gave the finishing strokes which, though few perhaps, added so much grace and beauty that a much higher price was paid for them than for all the labor of the others. The great value attached to the marble was given by the master, not by the other workmen, though they had toiled much longer than himself. Thus it is that skill always receives a richer reward than mere force-power.

In the common schools children are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, etc., which studies are well enough; but when a more extended education is sought, what are the usual additions? Latin, Greek, French, German, a little smattering of science, and other things which amount to still less. These studies certainly have a place in a complete education; the day has not passed for the mastery of language, as some affirm. They all have their uses, but

it is none the less true that in providing an education for the millions who must of necessity begin their life-tasks at an early age, a very different sort of education from this is required.

Considering the limited time they can give to education, and the occupations in most cases they are to pursue, who can doubt that greater attention ought to be paid than now is to the art of living? Think of the little instruction given in physiology, yet what study is more important? That it is practicable to master the study at an early age has been proved by its adoption and continuance in some of the schools. To create a strong body, and so fit it for physical and mental toil, is not this a task worthy of attention? Then, the study of climatology, too, and all those subjects which will enable the future laborer to toil to the best advantage. These physical studies may properly be considered one department of education. Beside this physical culture, comes next that of perfecting one's self in domestic economy. This is a broad field for inquiry, as it includes the study of foods, houses, ventilation, heating, cookery, clothing, etc. How grievously defective is the education of almost all persons in these things! Surely they are of the greatest importance. The laws of hygiene are second to none in their practical consequences. We ought not to trust to instinct in matters so grave, but acquire a thorough and useful education which will be of constant service.

The two principal ends sought after in such an education are, first, to develop the physical powers of man to the utmost, and to conserve his energies;

and secondly, to use the income he receives from his daily toil in the most economical manner. It is true that an education of this sort is quite as applicable to every class as to working-men.

Two other features remain for notice in the workman's education. The first relates to his vocation: such an education, in short, as is provided for him in many of the continental countries, and of late years in England. We have not space here to enlarge upon the topic and prescribe the various studies which ought to be mastered by those who propose to follow the varied occupations in which it is possible to exercise skill; suffice it to say, such schools are so thoroughly established in the old world that it would not be difficult to prescribe courses of study and methods of carrying them on in the United States.

The last point to be considered in the education of the working classes is of more importance than any other so far as it immediately affects capital. This point is to educate the working-men in the cost of production. The immediate object of this education is to wear off the antagonism between employed and employers, and prevent strikes. Now, the industrial classes know very little, if anything, about the profits of the business in which they are engaged, or the conditions upon which success depends. On account of their ignorance, they are unable to form any intelligible judgment as to what they ought to receive. They know not how great or small are the profits of their employers, and not infrequently strike supposing they ought to receive more, when perhaps they are overpaid in proportion to the returns received from their



toil. Again and again have workmen struck for higher wages when business was being conducted at a loss. This proves as clearly as anything can be proved how poorly they know whether business is profitable or not, for one would not accuse them of being so foolish as to act thus intentionally.

Employers are in part to blame for this. If they told their workmen more about their business, discontent would decline and strikes diminish in number and violence. But they rarely deign to do this, unless when men are about to strike, and then it is too late to reason with them. Their passions aroused, their employer's influence is gone; they regard his statements with suspicion; and his words are as chaff which the winds blow away. But if they were instructed in their cooler moments, the effect would be far more benign. Doubtless many a statement made by an employer which fell flat upon the ears of a workman at a time when he either had struck or was on the edge of striking, would have been believed and acted upon if put forth at an earlier period. We believe if men were informed at the proper time respecting the nature of their business, the conditions upon which success depended, many strikes would be avoided.

Of course, many will say: "It is absurd to suggest the expediency of exposing the details of our business to our workmen! Who ever heard of such a thing? Besides, it is not worthy of an employer to do anything of the kind." It is quite easy to reply conclusively to these assertions: In the first place, employers do occasionally make an exhibit of their

business, especially when a strike is threatened. Again and again have they done so. This answers the difficulty relative to the worthiness of the act. If he can do it at such times, he can do it at any time without loss of dignity. This, also, is a conclusive answer as to its practicability. He prepares a full statement with the view of convincing his men. He tells them the condition of his affairs, what his business is, the profits and losses, what they are likely to be, all, in short, necessary for them to know in order to form a competent judgment as to what they should do for themselves.

Two other objections, more difficult to answer, may be raised to making an exposition of one's business. The first is, workmen and the outside world would be informed concerning the employer's gains or losses. Suppose a manufacturer is making great gains, he does not want to advertise the fact by making a statement, for, in that case, others will engage in the same business, if possible, and so reduce profits by increasing the supply. Besides, the public would complain over the price paid, if they knew they were buying dearly; which is the same thing as saying they would complain if they knew an enormous sum was accruing to any one from the sale of his products.

This objection to uncovering one's business many will regard as unanswerable. We are not inclined towards this view, however, for every person ought to be satisfied with reasonable profits; and if he be making more, it is only just for the men to share them, and the outside world to know the fact. It is

clear enough that whenever employers are seeking to make the most they can from their business, and are never moved by humane motives, sound policy dictates silence. But when this is the case, workmen cannot be condemned for not maintaining silence. They are entitled to a fair share of the profits, and if employers will not tell what they are, how can they blame those employed for striking? They strike, in most cases, through ignorance which only employers can remove. This they will not do, and yet bitterly complain when their men attempt to obtain higher wages. Such conduct is very much like tempting a person to commit a crime, and then condemning him for doing it. So long as employers choose to keep the facts concerning their business from their workmen, they must not complain if the latter acquire very erroneous notions respecting it, and every now and then indulge in a strike. Let the capitalist remember that he often tempts his men to do these very things by maintaining the policy of silence regarding his business. Strikes will happen just so long as workmen remain ignorant in respect to the adequacy of their remuneration. When their masters get ready to show their hand in business, and thus lead the employed to see they are receiving a fair share of the profits, will they be satisfied and cease to strike. Let manufacturers inform their men from time to time of the conditions of trade, the state of the markets, the effect of a change in the tariff or other taxes, the discovery of new mines, in short, of all things affecting the business in question, and we are quite sure nothing will be heard from workmen provided they are receiving fair wages. Now, men are grossly

ignorant in many cases of the profits of masters, and almost always think they are making money. To educate them in fitting ways in the elements of business prosperity would open their eyes to the truth, and do much, in our opinion, to soften the asperity existing between the two classes.

The remaining objection to disclosing the condition of one's business is, it may lead to pecuniary embarrassment. Suppose a manufacturer is losing money, he fears that, if his condition be known, he cannot obtain credit or other assistance. If doing business in a public manner, people would be more prudent, and all would know better whom to trust. Not so many would become embarrassed, for they would manage their affairs more economically and honestly than now. Nothing would conduce more to the healthy growth of business, to improving its tone, to the cultivation of sound principles, than to keep it open to the scrutiny of the public. When men did become weak, we are not sure that all aid would be withdrawn from them. Provided they were honest and regarded as efficient in the management of their affairs, we see no reason why they should not be aided as heartily and as effectively as under a secret business system. In the case of dishonest and inefficient persons they would suffer more, but this is only just. What they lost, the public would gain.

In our judgment, this would prove one of the most effectual methods in averting strikes. Education in general is excellent, and ultimately will correct many mistakes and improve the feeling between men and masters, as it has done in Switzerland; but, if possi-



ble, measures are needed to produce a better state of things now. Did employers attempt to inform their men in times when good feeling between them prevailed, and in a systematic way, they would, we believe, be inclined to listen and remain content.

## IX.

## ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.

---

THE last method for settling the differences between employed and employer, is arbitration. This is not a modern remedy, for the *Conseils des Prud'hommes* have been in operation for a long period. Both in this and in foreign countries they have been tried long enough to test their utility.

Prior to the introduction of them at Nottingham, by Mr. Mundella, eight or nine years ago, strikes were of almost constant occurrence in the lace and hosiery trades. The bitterest feelings between men and masters were prevalent. A board for the adjustment of differences was instituted, composed of seven employers and seven workmen, elected by their respective classes, who met once a quarter or oftener upon the request of their members. At these meetings questions relating to wages and other difficulties were discussed in a friendly manner, and on many an occasion angry feelings were in this peaceful way assuaged. The essence of the system, in the opinion of the promoters, lay in its voluntary character. So long as this was the case, there was no room for jealousy on either side. It is needless to say that the experiment has proved most successful. Mr. Mundella testified before a committee of investigation as to the

straightforward character and fairness of the representative workmen who appeared at these arbitrations. Generally, it is found, say the Trade-Union Commissioners, that after free discussion, and, in most cases, some mutual concession, an understanding satisfactory to both parties is reached. Although the arrangement is not legally binding, it is considered so morally, and is generally acquiesced in and acted upon until a change of circumstances calls for a readjustment.

So successful, indeed, have been these arbitrations, that the Royal Commissioners of Great Britain appointed to inquire into the origin and rules of trade-unions and to recommend plans for establishing better relations between capitalists and workmen, declare in their report that the establishment of boards of arbitration seems to offer a remedy at once speedy, safe, and simple. They require no complicated machinery, no novel division, no new mode of conducting business, no additional legislation, no legal powers or penalties. All that is needed is for certain representative employers and workmen to meet at regular stated times, and amicably discuss around a table the common interests of their common trade or business. There is not a single business in which this system might not at once be adopted, and no reason could be seen for supposing the results to be less satisfactory than the results at Nottingham. Under such a system, the Commissioners hopefully looked for a peaceful and prosperous future for the industry of Great Britain. Is it unreasonable to predict that boards of arbitration could accomplish as much in the United States as in any other country?

# APPENDIX.

TABLE OF WAGES FOR WURTEMBERG.

	1830-39.	1840-49.	1850-59.	1860-69.	Percentage of increase.
Cotton-spinners....	\$0.28	\$0.31	\$0.35	\$0.45	65
Wool-spinners.....	.29	.29	.37	.45	57
Cotton-weavers....	.26	.27	.33	.41	60
Goldsmiths.....	.33	.27	.52	.66	60
Pianoforte-makers	.31	.43	.52	.66	77
Paper-makers.....	.25	.31	.35	.39	58
Printers.....	.45	.52	.52	.70	52
Carpet-makers.....	.29	.33	.37	.50	71
Hardware-makers	.27	.29	.41	.45	65
Silversmiths.....	.45	.37	.58	.75	61
Dyers.....	.29	.33	.37	.43	53
Tanners.....	.29	.31	.35	.43	51½
Masons.....	.35	.39	.47	.60	80½
Bricklayers.....	.27	.31	.37	.54	90
Carpenters.....	.27	.31	.37	.50	79½
Painters.....	.37	.43	.54	.68	81
Blacksmiths.....	.25	.27	.33	.39	62
Locksmiths.....	.27	.29	.33	.41	65
Coppersmiths.....	.27	.28	.43	.43	65
Tailors.....	.20	.25	.33	.35	65
Shoemakers.....	.20	.22	.29	.35	67
Saddlers.....	.25	.29	.33	.39	61½
Joiners.....	.25	.29	.33	.41	61½
Tinmen.....	.25	.29	.33	.39	57
Day laborers.....	.20	.25	.29	.35	47



## WEEKLY WAGES IN AUSTRIA.

Blacksmiths.....	\$7.20	Printers.....	\$2.30
Shoemakers.....	6.00	Paper-makers.....	4.32
Tailors.....	7.50	Ship-carpenters.....	5.76
Masons.....	6.00	Tanners and curriers.....	7.20
Plasterers.....	6.00	Woolen manufactures:	
Carpenters.....	7.20	Washing.....	1.40
Painters.....	9.00	Sorting.....	2.40
Machinists, second grade...	2.77	Scouring.....	1.92
Iron-moulders, third grade.	.95	Carding.....	1.80
Cabinet-makers.....	12.00	Spinning.....	4.00
Wheelwrights, second grade	6.00	Spooling and warping....	1.20
Tailors.....	15.00	Dressing.....	1.52
Cotton-spinneries, highest...	5.76	Weaving.....	3.20
“ lowest.....	1.15	Fulling.....	1.60
Cotton-factories, highest....	3.60	Burling.....	1.40
“ lowest.....	1.15		

The above figures are gold prices, and are taken from the Fifth Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor.

## MONTHLY WAGES AT MOSCOW.

COTTON-MILLS.			WOOLEN-MILLS.		
	1860.	1869.		1860.	1869.
Pickers.....	\$3 22	\$3.66	Card-cleaners.....	\$5.33	\$6.00
Strippers.....	5.50	6.29	Card-tenters.....	2.66	3.15
Spinners.....	9 06	9.50	Shearers.....	3.00	3.15
Reelers.....	4.27	4.72	Weavers.....	6.00	6.66
Winders.....	5.25	5.25	Cloth-cleaners.....	5.00	4.66
Warpers.....	8.86	7.72	Wool-washers.....	5.66	5.66
Weavers.....	8.33	8.16	Cloth-dyers.....	5.33	5.66
Enginemmen.....	10.33	12.16	Cloth-pressers.....	6.00	6.00
Stokers.....	5.60	7.09	Spinners.....	2.66	3.00
Mechanics.....	10.83	12.00			
Blacksmiths.....	12.00	13.66	PAPER-MILLS.		
Joiners.....	8.22	11.33		1860.	1869.
Watchmen.....	3.86	4.03	Workmen.....	\$5.33	\$5.66
Day laborers.....	4.39	5.19	Workwomen.....	3.33	4.00

## PRICES OF PROVISIONS AT MOSCOW.

	1860.	1869.
Flour, white, best, per cwt.....	\$4.75	\$5.77
“ “ 2d “ .....	3.83	4.12
“ “ 3d “ .....	3.70	3.70
Malt, per cwt.....	1.85	3.31
Salt, “ .....	1.85	2.06
Oil, “ .....	12.00	13.25
Salted beef, per cwt.....	5.75	8.77
Butter, per pound.....	.16	.18
Small fish, per pound.....	.06	.11
Beef, 1st quality, per pound.....	.08	.09
“ 2d “ “ .....	.06 1/2	.07
Buckwheat, per measure.....	1.19	.86
Wheat, “ .....	1.06	1.19
Peas, “ .....	2.89	3.70

WAGES IN HURLIMANN'S SPINNING-MILLS,  
SWITZERLAND.

	1835.	1840.	1845.	1850.	1855.	1860.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
Foremen.....	33 1/2	33 1/2	36	36	42	44
Carders, men and boys .....	19	24	24	25	28	24
Bobbin and fly-frame women.....	12	14	14 1/2	14 2/5	13	18
Piecers, girls.....	9 3/5	9 3/5	12	12	13	16
Spinners on hand mules.....	24	30	30	35	40	41
Spinners on self-acting mules.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Reelers, women.....	14	20	17	20	20	22

  

	1865.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	Inc. Per ct.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	
Foremen .....	46	...	...	56	62	84
Carders, men and boys.....	30	...	...	30	38	99
Bobbin and fly-frame women .....	20	...	...	22	28	125
Piecers, girls.....	20	...	...	22	26	140
Spinners on hand mules.....	42	...	...	63	65	113
Spinners on self-acting mules.....	...	30	40	44	44	49
Reelers, women.....	25	...	...	30	33	60

The preceding table is extracted from a very complete one prepared by Mr. Gould, and appended to his Report relating to the Condition of the Industrial Classes in Switzerland. To the table he has added the following note:

Average increase 122 per cent. since 1835, or nearly  $3\frac{2}{3}$  per cent. per annum. Corresponding increase in the cost of food and lodging  $110\frac{1}{3}$ , or  $3\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. per annum. The difference between the two sums is only  $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. per annum, "but in reality the cost of living has increased at the same ratio as wages, for the number of those in receipt of the lower rate of wages is greater than that of those in receipt of the higher rate."

### WAGES AT THE PACIFIC MILLS, LAWRENCE, MASSACHUSETTS, PAID IN 1861 AND 1873.

In 1861 the employees worked sixty-six hours, in 1873 sixty-two and a half hours per week.\*

	Year 1861. Pay by hour.	Year 1873. Pay by hour.	Per cent. of in- crease.	Year 1861. Pay by week of 66 hours.	Year 1873. Pay by week of $62\frac{1}{2}$ hours.	Per cent. of in- crease.
Sorters.....	\$0.1375	\$0.1754	27.5	\$9.07	\$10.96	20.8
Pickers. ....	.0846	.1343	58.7	5.58	8.39	50.3
Grinders.....	.1044	.156	49.4	6.89	9.75	41.5
Card-strippers..	.0752	.1343	76.6	4.96	8.39	69.1
Drawing.....	.0456	.0826	81	3.00	5.16	72
Slubber.....	.0614	.1294	110.7	4.05	8.08	99.5
Intermediate ...	.0636	.1268	99.3	4.20	7.92	88.6
Jack-frame ....	.0708	.1335	88.6	4.67	8.34	78.6
Mule-spinners..	.11	.2054	86.7	7.26	12.83	76.7
Frame " ..	.0535	.0962	79.8	3.53	6.01	70.2
Spoolers.....	.0557	.0967	73.6	3.68	6.04	64.1
Warpers.....	.0742	.1394	87.8	4.89	8.71	78.1
Dressers.....	.1463	.2622	79.2	9.66	16.38	69.5
Weavers.....	.0704	.1244	76.7	4.65	7.77	67

Sorters, grinders, card-strippers, mule-spinners, and dressers are males; pickers, males and females; all others are females, girls being employed for drawing.

\* This and the following table are extracted from the Fifth Report of the Bureau of Statistics of Massachusetts.

# WAGES AT THE WASHINGTON MILLS, LAWRENCE, MASSACHUSETTS, PAID IN 1861 AND 1873.

In 1861 the employees worked sixty-six hours, in 1873 sixty-two and a half hours per week.

	Year 1861. Pay by hour.	Year 1873. Pay by hour.	Per cent. of in- crease.	Year 1861. Pay by week of 66 hours.	Year 1873. Pay by week of 62½ hours.	Per cent. of in- crease.
Carding, males....	\$0.069	\$0.131	89.8	\$4.55	\$8.18	79.7
“ females...	.052	.088	69.2	3.43	5.50	60.3
Spinning, males....	.096	.164	70.8	6.33	10.25	61.9
“ females..	.072	.129	79.1	4.75	8.06	69.6
Weaving, males....	.091	.141	55	6 00	8.81	46.8
“ females..	.070	.128	82.8	4.62	8.00	73.1
Fulling, males....	.072	.136	88.8	4.75	8.50	78.9
Picking, “ .....	.073	.133	82.2	4.81	8.31	72.7
Shearing, “ .....	.076	.128	68.4	5.01	8.00	59.6
Finishing, “ .....	.089	.153	71.9	5.87	9.56	62.8
“ females..	.048	.102	112.5	3.17	6.38	101.3
Packing, males....	.072	.144	100	4.75	9.00	89.4
“ females..	.062	.110	77.4	4.09	6.94	69.7
Sorting, males....	.099	.161	62.6	6.53	10.06	54
Dye-house, males..	.085	.151	77.6	5.61	9.44	68.2
Dressing, males....	.098	.152	55.1	6.47	9.50	46.8
“ females..	.069	.145	110.1	4.55	9.06	99.1
Skein - spooling, females.....	.063	.118	87.3	4.16	7.38	77.4
Burling, males....	.081	.137	69.1	5.35	8.56	60
“ females....	.055	.105	90.9	3.63	6.56	80.7
Drying, males.....	.078	.122	56.4	5.15	7.63	48.1
Gigging, “ .....	.076	.134	76.3	5.02	8.38	66.9
Scouring, “ .....	.074	.134	81.	4.88	8.38	71.7
Carpenters, males..	.164	.272	65.8	10.82	17.00	57.1
Machinists, “ ..	.142	.215	51.4	9.37	13.44	43.4
Watch, fire, and yard hands.....	.099	.167	68.6	6.53	10.44	59.8



PUBLICATIONS OF J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.

---

NOW COMPLETE, IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES.

---

THE  
NEW STANDARD EDITION  
OF  
PRESCOTT'S WORKS

WITH THE  
Author's Latest Corrections and Additions.

EDITED BY  
JOHN FOSTER KIRK.

---

AS FOLLOWS:

*HISTORY OF FERDINAND AND ISABELLA,*  
3 Volumes.

*HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO,*  
3 Volumes.

*HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF PERU,*  
2 Volumes.

*HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF PHILIP II.,*  
3 Volumes.

*HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF CHARLES V.,*  
3 Volumes.

*PRESCOTT'S MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS,*  
1 Volume.

---

This Edition is Illustrated with Maps, Plates, and Engravings.  
Price per volume, 12mo, in fine English cloth, with black  
and gold ornamentation, \$2.25; library sheep,  
\$2.75; half calf, gilt back, \$4.50.

---

"It would be difficult to point out among any works of living historians the equal of those which have proceeded from Mr. Prescott's pen."—*Harper's Magazine.*

"We would gladly do our share towards making acknowledgment of the debt of gratitude we all owe to Messrs. Lippincott & Co. for the superb and even monumental edition of the *Works* of William H. Prescott, which they

have at last brought to completion."—*New York Christian Union.*

"The typography, indeed the entire mechanical execution, of these books is exquisite; and we unhesitatingly pronounce the series not only the best edition of Prescott's Works ever published, but one of the handsomest set of books the American press has given us."—*Boston Journal.*